

A
584.9
M29

LETTERS

ON THE

ANGLO-ISRAEL FOLLY.

BY

A. MALACHI.

TRURO, N. S.

ROBERT McCONNELL, PRINTER.

1880.

DS131
.55
c.1

SECRET

1

TERMINAL

11/11/11

DS
S
C

LETTERS

—ON THE—

ANGLO-ISRAEL FOLLY.

BY A. MALACHI.

THE CREED OF THE HINITES.

The Hinites are a religious sect which have lately sprung into existence. They derive their name from their leader, Edward Hine of England. They are not numerous; they are, however, very zealous, and are busily seeking to make converts. They may be regarded as divided into two classes, the confirmed Hinites and the slack Hinites. The former have no doubt about their origin. They pay no attention to reason or arguments. They have adopted their belief and are bound to live and die in it. The latter are not altogether sure about their origin. Doubts as to their being Israelites occasionally rise up their minds.

That there are among the Hinites, especially among the slack Hinites, intelligent, honest and respectable men and women I admit. I fall in with such here and there. It is not their good sense or piety however that makes them Hinites, but their want of acquaintance with history and the rules of Biblical interpretation. They are very much at Hine's mercy with respect to historical matters. They take for granted that the statements in this pamphlet are true. Of the interpretation of prophecy they know nothing. They never take the trouble of studying the Old Testament in the light of the New.

The following is their creed:

1. We believe we are the descendants of the ten tribes, the followers of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin.

2. We believe that in the year 720 B. C., the tribe of Dan left the land of Israel in ships, that they arrived in safety in the north of Ireland, that they were there known as the Tuatha De Danann; that they spoke the Hebrew language there, and that the north of Ireland Protestants are their lineal descendants.

3. We believe that the tribe of Simeon came with the tribe of Dan in their ships to the west coast of Scotland, that they landed there, that they

DS131

.S5

C.1

38195-

gradually removed to the south, that they finally settled in Wales, and that the Welsh people are all descended from them.

4. We believe that the tribes carried into Assyria by Shalmaneser, in the year 721 B. C., remained in the land to which they were carried until the days of the apostles; that they and they only are the lost sheep of the house of Israel spoken of in the tenth chapter of Matthew; that the apostles went directly to them, and preached the Gospel to them; that some time after the Gospel had been preached to them they moved westward; and that as barbarous and heathen marauders, under the name of Saxons, that is, Isaac's sons, they landed in England in the year 449.

5. We believe that the tribe of Benjamin embraced the gospel, that they escaped from Jerusalem to Pella, prior to the siege by the Roman army, that they went in ships to Italy, that they lived for some time in Normandy in France, that in the year 1066 they crossed over to England under William the conqueror; and that all who can trace their origin to the Normans are true Israelites of the tribe of Benjamin.

6. We believe that the Yankees are of the tribe of Manasseh.

7. We believe that the Celts of Ireland are accursed Canaanites, and that we should use them as hewers of wood and drawers of water.

8. We believe that in the year 580 B. C., Jeremiah and Baruch came to Tara in Ireland; that they had with them a princess of the house of David, named Tephî; that Éochaid, the King of Ireland, adopted the Jewish religion and married Tephî; that Queen Victoria is descended from Éochaid and Tephî; and that thus the line of David rules over Israel.

9. We believe that when Jeremiah came to Ireland he took with him the stone on which Jacob slept, and that it is upon this stone that the sovereigns of Britain are crowned.

10. We believe that seven-eighths of the Bible are generally misunderstood by Christians.

11. We believe that the Bible is addressed to three classes of men, the Israelites, the Jews, and the Gentiles; the Israelites being the tribes of Reuben, Simeon, Gad, Asher, Naphtali, Zebulon, Issachar, Dan, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin; and the Jews being the tribes of Judah and Levi.

12. We believe it is a great waste of money to be sending missionaries to the Jews, the wicked descendants of Judah and Levi.

13. We believe that the Jews will return to their own land, build a temple, and re-establish the ceremonial and civil laws of Moses.

14. We believe that we, the Israelites, shall also go back to the Holy Land; not all of us, but two out of every family.

15. We believe that in our return procession we shall all be under one commander-in-chief, every city having its own company, every company being commanded by its own captain, and every captain instructing his own men "how to act, where to halt, when to march, and what route to take."

16. We believe in the glory of the great pyramid, the glory of saving millions a year, the glory of long life, and twenty-four other glories of England.

17. We believe "from the marvellous teachings of the great pyramid" that our identity with Israel will be nationally established before the pre-

sent Tory Government of Britain shall go out of power, or some time before the end of 1881.

18. We believe that wherever we, the true Israelites settle, the aborigines, should and will die out.

19. We believe, with all Christian humility, that ten Englishmen, or true Israelites, can whip any day one hundred Gentiles, be they Highlanders, Irish Celts, or Cossacks.

All the Hinites do not believe the whole of this creed. Like other sects they have their heretics. The thoroughly orthodox hold that Hine's interpretations are all sound; the heretics maintain that some of these are not correct. They all believe, however, that the British, with the exception of the Irish Celts and the Highlanders, are identical with the ten tribes, that the Israelites constitute the aristocracy of the Christian Church, and they themselves are the most enlightened portion of that aristocracy. A. M.

II.

THE NEW RULES OF HERMENEUTICS.

Hermeneutics is the science which treats of the interpretation of the Scriptures. The Hinites are diligently at work trying to improve it. Horne's Introduction, Angus' Bible Hand Book, and Fairbairn's Hermeneutical Manual they have cast aside; they regard those works as of no more value than Belcher's Almanac for 1879. They have adopted three rules of interpretation to which they attach very great importance. They are as follows:—

1. Remember that the Bible never speaks of a member of any of the ten tribes, except the tribe of Benjamin, as a Jew; the Israelites are not Jews. 2. The Bible regards the human race as divided into three classes; the Israelites, the Jews, and the Gentiles. 3. Wherever in the Holy Scriptures, from the days of Isaiah to the days of John the apostle, you find the word Israel you may be sure that the reference is to the ten tribes. These rules are of course new. We cannot, however, speak of them as discoveries; they are inventions. There is no trace of their existence from Genesis to Revelation.

Rules of interpretation to be of any value must be based upon facts in the Bible, not upon fancies floating in the brains of speculative writers. That Hine's rules are not based upon facts can easily be shown. They contradict facts, and very clear facts too.

1. Ever since the period of the Babylonian captivity we find Israelites of all the twelve tribes spoken of as Jews.

Every person admits that those who formed the Kingdom of the ten tribes were not called Jews whilst in their own land. The Jews were the men of Judah, or those who formed the Kingdom of Judah. If a man belonged to that Kingdom, no matter of what tribe he was a member, he was called a Jew. 2 Kings 14 : 22, 16 : 6, 25 : 25. Jer. 32 : 12, 34 : 9.

The Kingdom of Judah consisted of the two whole tribes of Judah and Benjamin, of a great number from the ten tribes, and of the priests and Levites.

That there were thousands of persons from the ten tribes in the kingdom of Judah cannot be denied. A part of the territories of Simeon and Dan remained all along in possession of Judah. 1 Samuel 27: 6, 1 Kings 19: 3, 2 Chron. 11: 10 compared with Joshua 19: 1, 41, 42. In the reigns of Abijah and Asa the Kingdom of Judah obtained by conquest a portion of the Kingdom of Israel. 2 Chron. 13: 19, 15: 8, 17: 2. Many pious men left the Kingdom of Israel and settled in the Kingdom of Judah. 2 Chron. 15: 9-10. We are distinctly told that "in Jerusalem dwelt of the children of Judah, and of the children of Benjamin, and of the children of Ephraim and Manasseh." 1 Chron. 9: 3.

The people who upon the return from Babylon, formed the new commonwealth of Israel are called Jews. Ezra 4: 12. Josephus' Antiq. 11: 5: 7. That commonwealth consisted of the descendants of the Jews who had not been carried away to Babylon and of the Jews who returned from Babylon. That like the Kingdom of Judah, it embraced persons from all the tribes of Israel cannot be doubted. It is altogether improbable that there were no members of the ten tribes among the poor who had not been carried to Babylon. It is also improbable, when we find the Persian monarchs address their decrees respecting going back to Judea to "all the people of God," to "all who were of the people of Israel," that no members of the ten tribes returned. Ezra 1: 3, 7: 13. It is evident that the Jews of the new commonwealth regarded themselves as the three representatives of the Hebrew nation. They called themselves Israel, and were in the habit of offering up sacrifices for the twelve tribes. Ezra 2: 70, 3: 1, 6: 17, 10: 1, 5. Neh. 11: 3, 20; 12: 47, 13: 3. Anna, the prophetess, belonged to the tribe of Asher. Luke 2: 36.

The Israelites who remained in Babylon are called Jews. Esther. Acts 2: 5. That they belonged to all the tribes of Israel we cannot doubt. The Israelites of the house of Judah would scarcely at as early a period as the days of Ahasuerus, be scattered over the one hundred and twenty-seven provinces of the Persian Empire. Esther 1: 1, 3: 8.

Paul speaks of those to whom the oracles of God were given as Jews. Rom. 3: 1-2. The oracles of God we know were given to the twelve tribes, God's visible church. Must we not infer then that Paul regarded the whole twelve tribes as Jews? It is evident that in his day the words Hebrew, Israelite, and Jew were synonymous terms.

The Israelites who lived in Judea in the days of our Saviour are throughout the whole of the New Testament called Jews; so also are the Israelites among whom the apostles labored.

2. The Scriptures regard the human race as divided into two classes: those who profess to worship God according to his word, and those who do not profess to worship him according to his word.

From the days of Moses until the death of Solomon God's professed followers were one politically as well as ecclesiastically. Jereboam's rebellion divided them politically; some belonged to the Kingdom of Judah and some to the Kingdom of Israel. It did not, however, divide them ecclesiastically. The ten tribes as well as the two tribes went up to Jerusalem to worship God. In an ecclesiastical point of view the twelve tribes were never divided. They all belonged to the same church. God spoke of them all as his people. It was as such, as his undivided church, and not

as the people of Rehoboam, or the people of Jeroboam, He made them the gracious promises which we find in the writings of the prophets.

The Old Testament and the New divide the human race in the same way. In the Old Testament we read of God's people and the heathen nations around them; but not of a third class of men. In the New Testament we read of Jews and Gentiles, but never of Israelites, Jews and Gentiles. Should any person affirm that the two classes, Jews and Gentiles, do not include all men, all I have to say in reply is that they unquestionably include all sinners, and all to whom the gospel was to be preached. Rom. 1:13-16, 2:9, 3:1-19.

3. The term Israel generally denotes the Hebrew people, or the descendants of the twelve sons of Jacob regarded as a distinct people, the covenant people of God.

The name Israel at first belonged to an individual. It was the name which the Lord gave to Jacob. Jacob's descendants the twelve tribes, adopted it as their national name. When the ten tribes rebelled, being a majority of the children of Israel, they assumed it as the name of their Kingdom. They had, however, no legal right to it; they were only a portion of Israel, and they did not represent ancient Israel as truly as the house of Judah did. Even during the national existence of the ten tribes we find the Kingdom of Judah spoken of as Israel. 2 Chron. 12:6, 21:2. The Jews who returned from the Babylonian captivity resumed the old national name of Israel. Ezra 4:3. Neh. 11:3. This they did because they were the true representatives of the Israel of Moses and Joshua, and the Israel of David and Solomon. In our Saviour's day Judea was called the land of Israel and its inhabitants Israelites. Matt. 2:20, 8:10, 9:33. Luke 1:80. John 1:47, 3:10. Acts 21:28.

But the chief thing to be determined in discussing matters with the Unitarians is the sense in which the prophets employ the term Israel. The very first time Isaiah uses it he refers especially to the two tribes, Is. 1:1-3. Jeremiah addresses the men of Judah as the house of Israel, Jer. 5:15. Ezekiel also looked upon them as the true theocracy, Ezek. 17:2, 19:1, 20:1, 21:2. Daniel who was of the children of Judah speaks of his people as Israel, Dan. 9:20. Joel tells the children of Zion or Jerusalem that when certain blessings should be given them they would know that the Lord was in the midst of Israel, Joel 2:23-27. Haggai regarded the Jews of the restoration as the representatives of the people who came out of Egypt, Haggai 2:5. Malachi uniformly speaks of the new Hebrew common-wealth as Israel. He makes no reference to the ten tribes, Mal. 1:1, 2:11, 3:4.

As a general thing the term Israel denotes in the prophets the children of Israel considered as God's covenant people; in a few places it is used in its political sense, or as the name of the ten tribes in their organized capacity.

Bishop Titcomb, though a strong Anglo-Israelite, admits that the term Israel does not in all cases in the Prophets refer to the ten tribes. "You are aware," he says, "that this word Israel is often used to denote the whole Hebrew nation. There is consequently a great danger of taking up some passages which were intended to apply to the whole people, and transferring them to the ten tribes exclusively. I shall be on my guard against that danger; for I am free to confess that I have found

our friend Jones falling into it several times." By his "friend Jones" he evidently means Mr. Hine.

Hine's ideas respecting the expression "all Israel" are most extraordinary. His words are: "The term 'all Israel' is never applied to Judah. The 'all' is not an adjective, it is linked to Israel; the two words together form a proper noun. 'Ali Israel' is the name of the ten tribes or of any portion of the ten. The one tribe of Benjamin is repeatedly referred to as all Israel."

The expression "all Israel" is frequently employed in connection with the house of Judah. 2 Chron. 12: 1, 24: 5. It is also employed in connection with the Jews who returned from Babylon. Ezra 2: 70, 8: 25, 10: 5; Neh. 8: 73, 12: 47. That the one tribe of Benjamin is frequently referred to as all Israel is a statement which is as far from the truth as the North Pole is from the South. The tribe of Benjamin by itself is never spoken of as Israel.

Hine gives the following account of the meaning of the expression "house of Israel":—"When God in prophecy speaks to the house of Israel He does not refer to the Jews. Such expressions as the house of Israel wholly, and the whole house of Israel are never applied to Judah. The special mission of Christ and his disciples was to the ten tribes. Matt. 10: 5-6."

As the ten tribes had no national existence in the days of Moses it must surely follow that by the expression "whole house of Israel" in Lev. 10: 6 we are to understand the twelve tribes, and not the special favourites of the Hinites. Ezekiel prophesied to the people of Judah, yet he never hesitated to address them as "the house of Israel." He uniformly speaks of them under that name. When he says "These bones are the whole house of Israel," whether he refers to the ten tribes or not, he unquestionably refers to the house of Judah.

The command in Matt. 10: 5-6 had reference merely to a temporary mission upon which the Apostles were sent. This is evident from the subject of their preaching, and from the fact that they were away only a short time. What they preached was, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand;" not "Christ is risen from the dead." We have an account of their return in Mark 9: 30 and Luke 9: 10. Now how could it be possible for the Apostles in a few weeks or months to visit the Israelites of the ten tribes who were all beyond the Euphrates? There were no railroads in their time; they had not even swift horses at their command. It is evident that the lost sheep of the house of Israel among whom the Apostles laboured during their brief mission were the Jews of Palestine. It was after the resurrection of Christ, not before it, that the Apostles got their grand marching orders. Their orders were, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." How different from the command in Matt. 10: 5-6! Christ had now, however, by his death broken down the middle wall of partition between the Jews and the Gentiles. The glorious latter days had come. The doors of the church were thrown widely open for all men. Henceforth there was to be no difference between the Jew and the Greek; believers of all nations were to be one in Christ Jesus. Rom. 10: 12; Eph. 2: 14-15.

I think I have now shown that Hine's rules for interpreting prophecy

are really rules for misinterpreting it. To those who study the writings of the prophets I would give the following directions:—

1. "As new born babes desire the sincere milk of the word that ye may grow thereby." Search the Scriptures not for arguments in support of some crotchet which has got into your heads, but for food for your souls.

2. Consider the context carefully. The Bible looks upon man as a rational being and addresses him as such. It is not a jumble of disconnected sentences; it has order in it. Read not merely the verse in which you are specially interested, but also the verses which go before it, and the verses which follow it, consider what the writer is treating of.

3. Find out the time in which the Prophet whose writings you are studying lived, the circumstances in which he was placed, and the people to whom he prophesied. Joel, Jonah, Amos, and Hosea lived before the destruction of the kingdom of Israel; Isaiah and Micah lived at the time of its destruction; Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel lived at the time of the Babylonian captivity; and Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi after the return of the Jews from Babylon. Hosea and Amos prophesied to the ten tribes; Joel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Ezekiel to the people of Judah; and Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi to the Jews who had returned from Babylon.

4. Remember that owing to the typical character of the Old Testament institutions some predictions refer to two things; they refer partially to one thing, fully to another thing, the former being a type of the latter. To this class of predictions belongs the promise made to Abraham that he would have a numerous offspring, the promise that the throne of David's Kingdom would be established forever, and the promise that God's people would return from Babylon. The first of these promises finds its chief fulfilment in the countless number of the saved; the second in the establishment of Christ's Kingdom; and the third in the multitude who, under the gospel dispensation, have come and will yet come to worship in the real Zion or Jerusalem, the church of God.

5. Compare one part of the Scriptures with another. Your interpretation may contradict the Bible, but the Bible rightly understood never contradicts itself. It is all the work of one mind, the work of Him who is infinite in knowledge and truth. The doctrines of the New Testament are only the doctrines of the Old in a clear and fully developed form. It is therefore always of the greatest advantage in interpreting a passage in the Old Testament to find it quoted in the New. Whatever it might at first sight appear to mean we know that it means just what the Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles say it means. To their expositions then let us in all cases gladly, fully, and thankfully submit.

A. M.

III.

THE HINITES ON PROPHECY.

The Hinites are very fond of the prophets. They are continually searching their writings. They prize them chiefly on account of what they regard as promises to Queen Victoria and the Anglo-Saxons. Every passage in which the word Israel occurs, they assure us, refers to Great Bri-

tain. Poor Dr. Cumming! He is a Christian, a scholar, and a man of ability; yet the Hinites have cast him wholly into the shade!

The Hinites find at least a thousand and one proofs in the prophets that the people of Great Britain are almost all descended from the ten tribes. A few of these proofs, especially those which their learned doctors of divinity regard as unassailable, we shall briefly consider:

1. "The ten tribes must be found in an island home; Great Britain is an island; therefore the people of Britain are Israelites. Proof—'The isles shall wait for his law.' Is. xli. 4."

I suppose the Hinites will admit that the person spoken of in Is. xlii., 4, as the administrator of the law, is the Saviour; what they hold is that the people of the isles were to be the ten tribes. How the Hinites can show that by the word isles in this passage we are to understand places surrounded by water as Great Britain and Ireland are, I don't know. I am sure that the primary meaning of the word translated isles, is *dry land*, whether surrounded by water or not. How will the Hinites explain Is. xlii. 15, where it is said, "I will make the rivers islands?" Even the secondary meaning of the Hebrew word translated island is not a place surrounded by water, but a place adjacent to the sea. Phœnicia might thus be called an island. The Old Testament was translated into Greek in the year 277 B. C. This translation is known as the Septuagint, from a tradition that it was made by seventy learned Jews. The apostles frequently quote from it. Its rendering of the statement, "The isles shall wait for his law" is "upon his name shall the Gentiles trust." Matthew sanctions this rendering as correct; he merely changes the preposition *upon* into *in*. Matt. xii., 21. Thus then according to the uninspired seventy Jews of Alexandria and the inspired apostle of Galilee, the islands that were to wait for the laws of the Messiah were to be islands of Gentiles not of Israelites. I would humbly suggest to those who may read "the forty-seven identifications" the propriety of following Matthew's interpretation of prophecy rather than Hine's interpretation.

2. "Israel's isles must be north-west of Palestine; Britain is exactly where it ought to be; therefore the people of Britain are the ten tribes. Proofs—Is. xxiv. 15, Is. xliii. 5, Is. lix. 19, Jer. iii. 12, 18, Jer. xxiii. 8."

Is. xxiv. 15 reads,—*"Wherefore glorify ye the Lord in the fires, even the name of the Lord God of Israel in the isles of the sea."* There is no reference to the west in this passage in my Bible; it seems, however, that in Hine's Bible there is such a reference, for in this pamphlet he quotes it thus: *"glorify the name of the Lord God of Israel in the western seas."*

Is. xliii. 5 reads,—*"Fear not, for I am with thee; I will bring thy seed from the east and gather thee from the west; I will say to the north, give up, and to the south, keep not back."* An ordinary Christian would infer from this passage that God's people were to be gathered from all quarters of the globe; Hine, however, finds in it a plain proof that the ten tribes could be found only in the west. We must however remember that the Hinites pitch aside the east, north and south; they quote merely the words, *"I will gather thee from the west."* They don't like the south, it is too hot for them.

Is. lix. 19 reads—*"So shall they fear the name of the Lord from the west and his glory from the rising sun."* The old commentators imagined that this meant that the name of the Lord would be feared from the east

to the west, or from the rising to the setting sun; the new commentators tell us that it means nothing of the kind, and that it is only stupid persons that will read farther than the word west. Their rule of interpretation is, "Read to the word west, then stop, shut your eyes, think, and believe that you are an Israelite."

Jer. iii. 18 reads: "In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel and they shall come together out of the land of the north to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers." Jer. iii. 12, and Jer. xxiii. 8 also speak of the Jews as coming from the land of the north.

According to the Hinites Jeremiah could on the foggiest day turn round and point with his finger to the British Isles, although these isles were wholly unknown in his day to the Jews, Phœnicians, Greeks, and Romans. As however he had no term for north-west, he was compelled to speak of Britain sometimes as in the north, and sometimes as in the west. He took for granted that people would know that he meant a country half way between the north and the west. He was, however, strange to say, wholly misunderstood until the Hinites sprang up in the world. The way they came to know what he meant was by the application of a new law in hermeneutics. The law is this: "When two things do not seem to agree in the prophecies, split the difference and you will arrive at the truth."

By the land of the north, Jeremiah means the Babylonian empire, and neither Great Britain, Canada, nor Siberia. He never says that the children of Israel as a people were to come from the west, he does, however, say that they were to come from the north. "Halah and Habor by the river of Gozan" was as much to the north of Palestine as Britain is. The northern part of the Babylonian Empire was directly north of it. That empire in Jeremiah's day included the following countries: Babylonia proper or Chaldea, Mesopotamia, Assyria, Armenia and the adjacent districts as far north as the Caucasus, Cilicia, Syria, Palestine, Phœnicia, and Idumea. As the ten tribes and also the two tribes were captives in the Babylonian Empire, it is highly probable that the prophet would expect their return from that quarter. It was very natural for the Jews to regard Babylon as a northern country, because the Babylonians always invaded their country from the north; they could not indeed owing to the great Arabian desert invade it from the east. Nebuchadnezzar waited in "Riblah in the land of Hamath" whilst his generals were laying siege to Jerusalem; and Riblah, we know, was on the Orontes, straight north of the capital of Judea. But Jeremiah certainly knew his own geographical terms better than Hine, or his most learned follower. That by the land of the north he meant Babylon is placed beyond dispute by the following verse: "Behold, I will send and take all the families of the north, saith the Lord, and Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon, my servant, and will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof." Jer. xxv. 9; see also Zech. ii. 6, 7. It is a historical fact that many of the children of Israel returned from Babylon in the year 536 B. C. By the children of Israel I do not mean the ten tribes, I mean the descendants of Jacob.

3. "The ten tribes must be a nation; the British are a nation therefore the British are the ten tribes. Proof, Jer. xxxi. 35, 36."

Jeremiah xxxi. 36 is: "If those ordinances depart from me, saith the

Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me." If by the word nation in this place we are to understand a people in their organized capacity, that is, a people with a ruler and laws of their own, it follows that the promise made has not been fulfilled. The ten tribes ceased to be a nation when carried into Assyria in the year 721 B. C., and the house of Judah ceased to be a nation when carried into Babylon in the year 606 B. C., or at any rate when Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus in the year seventy after Christ. The word translated nation, however, means a people. Gesenius in his Hebrew dictionary gives as its meaning, a people, a nation. It is rendered by the word people in several places in our English version, for example in Is. ix. 2, and Is. xlii. 6. In the very passage quoted by the Hinites the Septuagint translates it *ethnos*, a word which means a race, a people. That the radical meaning of *ethnos* is race the ordinary English scholar may know. He finds it in ethnology.

Now whilst the children of Israel have ceased from being a nation in the strict sense of that term, they have not ceased from being a people; up to this day they have been preserved as a distinct race.

4. "The Israelites were to be called by another name, Britain is a different name from Israel; therefore the British are the ten tribes. Proof. Is. 65: 15. He shall call his servants by another name."

If the reference in Is. 65: 15 be to the ten tribes it is somewhat strange that the statement is not, He shall call his servants by other names, and not merely by another name. Have they not been called by half a dozen names, such as, Seythians, Sacae, Saxons, Anglo-Saxons, English, Britons, Irish, Welsh and Normans?

The 65th chapter of Isaiah has no reference to the ten tribes as such; it refers to the church of Christ, represented in Isaiah's day by the Israelites who clung to the house of Judah. God's people have received a new name. They have been called Hephzi-bah, the delight of the Lord. Is. 62: 1-4. They have also received a new name in another way; they have ceased to be called Israelites, Hebrews, or Jews; they are now called Christians.

If by the servants of the Lord in Is. 65: 15 we are to understand, not those who actually keep the law of God, but Israelites according to the flesh, then it follows that those who were to be called by another name were the Israelites of the Kingdom of Judah. Is. 64: 9-12. Is. 65: 9, 15, 19.

5. "The ten tribes were to speak another tongue; the British do not speak Hebrew; therefore the British are Israelites. Proof. Is. 28: 11."

Hine in speaking of this proof says:—"Using another tongue is a proof of our identity. Yet this question has to be approached ethnologically and anthropologically, both of which sciences declare language to be a principal agency in the tracing of peoples. The declared opinion of eminent scholars is that the English language contains the roots of no less than eight hundred Hebrew words."

The sciences of "ethnologically" and "anthropologically" I never heard of before. It might be possible for the Hebrew to contain the roots of some English words, but how the English can contain the roots of Hebrew words, I cannot comprehend. The Hebrew it is well known was old and gray before the English came into existence.

Isaiah began to prophecy at Jerusalem about the year 759 B. C. In the 28th chapter he describes the destruction of the Kingdom of Israel (1-4), and the preservation and punishment of the Kingdom of Judah. (5-29). In the 9th verse and the 10th the prophet represents the people of the house of Judah as scoffing at the manner in which God instructed them by his prophets. "Does God," they said, "treat us as children? Does He deal with us as with infants just weaned? Do we need precept upon precept, line upon line?" In the 11th verse the punishment which was to come upon these scoffers is declared. "With stammering lips and another tongue will God speak to this people." That the people spoken of from the 5th verse to the 15th is the house of Judah is quite clear. As the crown of Ephraim is represented in the 3rd verse as trodden under feet, it follows that "the residue" of his people to whom the Lord was to be for a crown of glory must be the Kingdom of Judah. We are also told that the scornful men, or scoffers were in Jerusalem.

Isaiah 28 : 11 teaches, not that the barbarous Anglo-Saxons should be ignorant of Hebrew but that the Jews would be carried to Babylon and that they would there learn the lessons which they refused to learn in their own land. To speak with stammering lips means to speak unintelligibly, or in a foreign tongue. Is. 33 : 19. The language of the Babylonians was not intelligible to the Jews. Is. 36 : 11. The Jews did learn whilst in Babylon that it is an evil and bitter thing to sin against God. They learned also to hate idolatry.

6. "The Israelites whilst in the land of their exile were to become a great multitude; the Anglo-Saxons are exceedingly numerous; therefore the British are Israelites. Hosea 1 : 11."

Even if we are to understand Hosea 1 : 11 as teaching that the ten tribes were to become a great multitude in the land of their exile we have no occasion to go to Britain for its fulfilment. There is a passage in Josephus which the Hinites believe as firmly as they do the Gospel. It is this:—"The ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates till now, and are an immense multitude, and not to be estimated by numbers." Hosea's prediction it seems then was fulfilled before the ten tribes left the land of their captivity.

Hosea 1 : 11 is not a prediction respecting the ten tribes, but a prediction respecting the twelve tribes, or the descendants of Jacob. It is merely a quotation from Gen. 32 : 12.

The promise in Gen. 32 : 12 had a double meaning. It implied that Jacob should have a numerous natural offspring, and also a numerous spiritual offspring; of its fulfilment in the latter, as well as in the former sense, we have the fullest proof. John represents the redeemed as "a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations and kindred, and people, and tongues."

Though God cast off the ten tribes, yet the number of the children of Israel even in Judea was as the sand of the sea. The Jews after the return from Babylon increased with great rapidity. They were very numerous when Jerusalem was destroyed.

Though the reference in Hosea 1 : 11-12 may be primarily to the Jews of that nation, there can be no doubt that the chief reference is to the church under the Messiah. Rom. 9 : 23-26. A. M.

THE HINITES ON PROPHECY.

The Hinites depend chiefly for their proofs of the identity of the British nation with the ten tribes upon prophecy. Some of their prophetic proofs we have already considered; let us now have a look at few more of them.

1. "The Israelites were to find their isles too small for them and to found colonies; Britain has colonies all over the world, therefore the British are the ten tribes. Is. 49: 18-23. Is. 54: 1-3."

The primary reference in Is. 49: 18-23 is to the Jerusalem of the restoration. In the 14th verse, Zion or Jerusalem is represented as saying, "The Lord hath forsaken me." In the 15th verse the Lord begins to address words of comfort to Zion and continues addressing it to the end of the chapter. He assures Jerusalem that he had graven it upon the palms of his hands, and that its children would come back from Babylon, that it would have more inhabitants than it had before the captivity, and that kings should be its nursing fathers. These predictions we know were all literally fulfilled. The children of Israel returned from Babylon; Judea was crowded with people; thousands of its inhabitants moved to foreign lands; Cyrus, Artaxerxes, and Esther were the very best friends to God's people.

The secondary reference in Is. 49: 18-23 is to the great ingathering of spiritual children to the spiritual Zion, or the church of God. Under the Messiah God would show to the world that He had not forgotten his people, they would be so numerous that Judea could contain only a small part of them; the church would be in a most flourishing condition. Gal. 4: 26. Heb. 12: 22.

That the 54th chapter of Isaiah refers to the church of God no Christian can doubt. The Saviour and one of his inspired apostles quote it as referring to the church. John 6: 45. Gal. 4: 27. The church is called upon to make room for the millions that were to come into it under the Messiah. It is spoken of under the image of a tabernacle because the tabernacle was the place of religious worship among the Hebrews, the symbol of the church, before the erection of Solomon's temple.

There is not one verse in the Bible which teaches that the ten tribes were to have colonies. There are, however, hundreds of verses which teach that the church was to be extended by the conversion of the Gentiles. "Ask of me and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." The Bible was not given to puff up people with national pride, but to show the way of salvation to sinners, whether Jews or Gentiles.

2. "God was to make a full end of the nations among whom the Israelites should settle; the aborigines die out before the Anglo-Saxon colonists; therefore the British are Israelites. Jer. 30: 10-11, 46: 27-28."

Jeremiah says that God would make a full end of all the nations among whom the children of Israel would be "scattered." Well they were scattered among the Assyrians, the Medes and the Babylonians,—nations which so far as known to me have no existence at the present day. A full end has been made of them. The Assyrians came to an end as a nation in the year 606 B. C., the Medes in the year 538 B. C., and the Babylonians in the year 536 B. C. At the present day we can find without

trouble a people who call themselves Jews ; we cannot so readily, however, find a people who call themselves Assyrians, Medes, or Babylonians. Hine identifies the Germans with the Assyrians. Strange that an illiterate Englishman should know more about the origin of the learned Germans than they know themselves ! Truly wonders will never cease !

The Bible nowhere teaches that the aborigines were to die out before the ten tribes. The passages quoted by Hine refer not to individuals, but to nations. Besides the promises in those passages were specially given to the house of Judah. The Jacob or Israel of Jer. 30 : 10 includes the Israel and Judah of Jer. 30 : 1. Any person who will read the 44th, 45th, & 46th chapters of Jeremiah will see that it was to the house of Judah the promise in the last two verses of the last of these chapters was given. The ten tribes are frequently spoken of as Ephraim, but never as Jacob.

3. "The ten tribes cannot be conquered in their island home ; the Anglo-Saxons have never been conquered, therefore the British are Israelites. Is. 54 : 17."

It will be admitted, I suppose, by all sensible men that Is. 54 : 17. "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper" is a promise to the "barren" one spoken of in the first verse. By the barren one we are evidently to understand the church of God under the Old Testament which being confined within very narrow limits might in comparison with the missionary church of the New Testament, be regarded as barren. It was especially at the time of the Babylonian captivity in a very low condition ; its spiritual children were extremely few. That Is. 54 : 1 refers to the church of Christ is placed beyond all doubt by the apostle Paul who quotes it to prove that the Jerusalem which is above, or the church, is free and the mother of all believers. Gal. 4 : 27.

The church of God can never be destroyed. It has been persecuted by the Pharaohs, by the rulers of Babylon, and by the Pagan Emperors of Rome ; yet it is to-day in a more flourishing condition than ever. The fire of persecution cannot destroy it, because God is in it. "Lo I am with you alway even unto the end of the world."

It is not a fact that the Saxons have never been conquered. Charlemagne conquered the Saxons of Germany, and William the Norman conquered the Saxons of England.

I believe that Britain will not be conquered ; not, however, because the British are Israelites, but because they are Christians, and are with all their selfishness and irreligion doing more for the cause of Christ than any other nation.

4. "It was promised to Abraham that in Isaac should his seed be called ; the British are Saxons, that is Isaac's sons ; therefore the British are Israelites. Gen. 21 : 12."

One would suppose that the most ignorant person who reads Gen. 21 : 12 would know that the meaning is that the promised seed should be descended not from Ishmael but from Isaac. To derive the word Saxon from Isaac's son is certainly something new, very new, in philology. Webster derives it from *Seax*, a knife, a dagger ; and as the Saxons, when they came to Britain, were simply roving pirates, I have no doubt that they knew more about knives and daggers than they did about Abraham and Isaac.

5. "The children of Israel must have the line of King David ruling

over them; the Queen of Great Britain is descended from David; therefore the British are Israelites. 2 Sam. 7: 16; 1st Kings 9: 1-6; Jer. 13: 17-21; Ps. 132: 11."

In 2 Sam. 7: 12-16 we find an absolute promise to David. His throne was to be established forever, that is, not only to the end of the world, but through all eternity. Surely this promise must find its fulfilment in Christ, great David's greater son. Heb. 1: 8. In Hebrews it is quoted as referring to Christ. Heb. 1: 5. The promise to Solomon in 1 Kings 9: 4-5 is only a conditional promise. Did Solomon comply with the condition laid down? Did he walk before God as David his father walked? The promise in Jer. 33: 17-21 cannot refer exclusively to the literal seed of David. The plain promise is that David should be at no time without a son reigning upon the throne of Israel. But Hine himself admits that the children of Israel were many days without a King, either of David's line or any other. According to his theory they had no King of David's line from the time of their rebellion against Rehoboam until the accession of Queen Mary's son to the throne of England, a period of 2579 years. Though Queen Victoria should as a matter of fact be descended from David it would be impossible to speak of her as "a man" or as "a son." That Psalm 132: 11 refers to Christ cannot be called in question by any person who believes in the inspiration of the New Testament. Peter quotes it as referring to Him. Acts 2: 30. Hine of course denies that it refers to Christ, he says "it would be totally false if it did."

Hine gravely assures us that Jeremiah and Baruch came to Ireland, that they brought with them a Jewish princess named Tephi, that Eochaid the King of Ireland married this princess, and that Queen Victoria is lineally descended from her. Eochaid was originally a Pagan, but for the sake of getting Tephi he changed his religion and believed every thing she asked him to believe. He established the ten commandments as the law of his kingdom. He likewise introduced a great many Hebrew institutions and customs into the country. Ollamh foladh, Mur-ollamhain, reachtaire, tara, and breac are all pure Hebrew words.

The Bible does not inform us that Jeremiah and Baruch went to Ireland; neither does any other book ancient or modern. Some Jewish writers say that when Egypt was conquered by Nebuchadnezzar, they went to Babylon and died there in peace. Jerome says that both died in Egypt. That the Bible makes no mention of Tephi every body knows. That she is not referred to in any work of an earlier date than the year of our Lord 431 is certain. That she is not named in any book for hundreds of years after the Babylonian captivity, for at least 1200 years, no scholar will deny. Such a person never existed. I wonder if Hine has read "The Arabian Nights' Entertainments," a first rate book of its kind. If he has it is astonishing that he does not quote it as a thoroughly reliable historical work. No doubt he considers Robinson Crusoe as full of "undeniable facts."

The words which Hine represents as pure Hebrew cannot be found in the Hebrew dictionary; I find them, however, in the Irish dictionary. Instead of being pure Hebrew words they are pure Gaelic words. Ollamh means a doctor, or chief professor of a science, and foladh learning; thus ollamh foladh means professor of learning, or a learned man. Mur means a wall, a house, and ollamhain, professors or learned men; thus mur-

ollamhain means a house of learned men, or a college. Reachtaire or reachdaire, from reachd a law and fear, a man, means a lawgiver, a judge. Tara, properly Teamhair, means a pleasant place. Breac distorted into brug and brig means spotted or freckled. The Irish annalists never thought of Baruch when speaking of Simon Breac. I wish Hine would remember that a dot over a letter in Irish is equivalent to h. If he would bear this fact in mind we would not find ollam in his pamphlets in place of ollamh.

There is not the shadow of an evidence that the Queen is descended from King David; according to all history, fabulous and authentic, she is not.

6. "The ten tribes must have Jacob's pillow with them; it is the British coronation stone; therefore the British are Israelites. Gen. 28."

Hine says,— "The promise in Gen. 28: 15 must be to the ten tribes; it has not yet been fulfilled. Jacob's stone must be in existence till the restoration of Israel. It was brought to Ireland by Jeremiah Baruch. Teph was crowned on it. It is called Lia fail. Lia or leac is Irish and means a flat stone. Fail is a Hebrew word and means wonderful. This stone is referred to in Psalm 118: 22-23. It was the chief corner stone of the temple. Kings have been crowned on it in succession for 2450 years."

It is nowhere stated in the Bible that the ten tribes were to have Jacob's stone with them. The only account we have of this stone is in Genesis the 28th chapter. The promise in the 13th verse of that chapter is to Jacob and his seed. Now the seed of Jacob surely includes the two tribes as well as the ten. In the 15th verse there is a promise to Jacob personally. From Gen. 35: 1-7 we learn that it was fulfilled; Jacob returned in the course of thirty years to the very spot on which he had slept. Even if we regard it as a promise to Jacob's seed, it was fulfilled long ago; the children of Israel were in possession of Bethel for hundreds of years.

The stone on which Jacob slept served as a pillar to mark the spot on which he had his remarkable dream. When he returned it is likely that he made use of it in the altar which he built. What became of it afterwards is not known. That it was in Solomon's temple is an utterly groundless tradition. No man who believes in the inspiration of the New Testament can regard Ps. 118: 22-23 as referring to Jacob's stone. Christ is the chief corner-stone of God's true temple, the Church. Matt. 21: 42, Acts 4: 11, Eph. 2: 20, 1 Peter 2: 47.

The coronation stone of Westminster Abbey was taken from Scotland to England by Edward I. The Highlanders called it Lia fail. That one of these words is Gaelic and the other Hebrew no philologist can believe. They are both Gaelic words, and mean stone of destiny.

There is not the least evidence that the coronation stone came from Asia. No Hebrew author affirms that Jacob's pillow was ever moved from the spot on which Jacob slept. No heathen Greek or Roman writer makes any mention of either Jacob or his pillow. No Irishman could write about Jacob's stone before St. Patrick's day. No geologist will affirm that it must have come from Palestine. According to the oldest Irish annalists it came from Denmark; the Tuath de Danann brought it with them.

There is no evidence that the coronation stone in Westminster Abbey

was ever even in Ireland. Col. Robertson in his "Historical Proof Respecting the Gael of Alban" maintains that it was not. The Irish he holds would not allow their coronation stone to be brought to Argyle by the paltry colony of Dalriads. The learned author of "Scotland under her early Kings" agrees with Col. Robertson. According to Wintown the coronation stone came from Iona. Logan says "its history is carried back to a period far beyond all authentic record." He considers it certain that it was once at the castle of Dunstaffnage in Argyle. He tells us that "it is of a dark color and appears like the kind of stone found near Dundee."—Scottish Gael, 138.

There must at one time have been quite a number of coronation stones in Scotland and Ireland. When a king or chief entered upon his government it was very natural to place him upon a stone, so that his followers could see him. The stone on which the Lords of the Isles were crowned is still in existence. The stone on which the kings of Munster were crowned is also in existence; it is somewhere near the Cathedral of Cashel.

In his "Critical Dissertations," a work which Gibbon speaks of as replete with erudition and criticism, Dr. McPherson informs us that, according to the Irish annalists, "the coronation stone had a very extraordinary virtue till after the birth of Christ; whenever an Irish monarch was crowned on it, it made a strange noise and appeared in a surprising agitation." This I have no doubt will be very interesting information to the Hinites.

7. "The ten tribes must have the emblems of the lion and the unicorn; Britain has these very emblems; therefore the British are the ten tribes. Numbers 24: 8-9; Deut. 33: 17."

If Numbers 24: 8-9 and Deut. 33: 17 refer to national emblems it is clear that our flag, in order to correspond with the emblems mentioned in those passages, should have in it not only a lion and a unicorn but also a bullock. Hine has seen this, and gives what his disciples consider a very satisfactory reason for the absence of the bullock from the flag. "Without straining," he says, "the firstling of his bullock, the ox being sometimes applied to Israel, may fairly be said to emblemise the world-famed power of John Bull!" But Hine has to give a reason not only for the absence of the bullock, but also for the absence of a second horn on the unicorn. A second horn on the unicorn! Does not every Latin scholar know the unicorn must be a one-horned beast? Whatever the literal meaning of the word unicorn may be, the beast referred to in Deut. 33: 17 had two horns. The word translated unicorns is Reem, and is in the singular number. The person compared to the reem is Joseph; the horns of the reem are "the ten thousands of Ephraim and the thousands of Manasseh."

The Hinites should without any delay get the British Government to put another horn on the slender animal of our flag. It is also likely they will have to change its shape. It is highly probable that the reem of Moses was a species of wild ox. How any man can make himself believe that Numbers 24: 8-9 and Deut. 33: 17 refer to national emblems, it is difficult to comprehend. But man's capacity for being fooled is very great.

Probably I have said enough about the new interpretation of prophecy. That it is imposition not exposition is evident.

Hinism almost seems to be a judgment upon people for their neglect of the Old Testament. Many persons never read it at family worship. This is wrong; the whole Bible should be read. Even in the pulpit it is to be feared that the Old Testament does not receive its proper share of attention. Some ministers take almost all their texts from the New Testament.

The existence of Hineism and other absurdities in the church clearly shows the necessity of expounding the Bible more fully than is done. There is too much preaching from texts. The great revival in the days of Ezra resulted from reading and explaining the word of God.

I would advise persons of a limited education and a light purse, who would like to understand the prophets, to procure and study the following books:—Edwards' History of Redemption, The Portable Commentary, by Jamieson, Brown and Fausset, Barnes on Revelation, and the Bible Dictionary, issued by the American Tract Society. Edwards' History of Redemption is the best church history ever written. It throws a vast amount of light on the Old Testament. It costs only 80 cents. The Portable Commentary is evangelical, reliable and cheap. It is on the Old and New Testaments. It costs \$4.00. Barnes on Revelation is a capital work and should be bought along with the Portable Commentary. It costs about 90 cents. The American Tract Society's Bible Dictionary can be got for about \$1.50.

Now Hinites, look here! Use your trashy pamphlets for kindling the fire; they will give you more light in that way than in any other. Get good useful books and study them. Look for Christ and His Church in the prophets and not for Victoria and the British Isles.

A. M.

V.

THE ORIGIN OF THE NORTH OF IRELAND PROTESTANTS.

If a man were to come to you and say, I have the philosopher's stone, prove that I have not, you would laugh at him as a simpleton. If he had it and wished you to believe that he had it, he ought surely not merely to assert that he had it but to show to you by converting iron into gold before your eyes that he had it. When the apostles went forth among the Gentiles they did not say, our religion is from heaven, prove that it is not; what they said was, our religion is from heaven, listen and we will show you that it is. Now if the Hinites expect to get rational followers, instead of asking the world to prove that their theory is false, they should go to work and prove that it is true. This of course they try to do; they go to prophecy, history, ethnology, and philology for proofs. Their views of the origin of the people of the north of Ireland I shall consider in this letter.

The Hinites affirm that we have "ample evidence" that the tribe of Dan settled in the north of Ireland about the time of the Assyrian captivity, that is about 721 B. C.

It is not mentioned in any historical work, ancient or modern, that the tribe of Dan settled in Ireland. How then did Mr. Hine come to know

they did? The Tuatha de Danann he says, spoke Hebrew, and must have been Israelites of the tribe of Dan. The Tuatha de Danann are not mentioned by any Hebrew, Greek or Roman writer; our first account of them is from Irish fabulists. Sir James Ware, one of the most learned antiquarians that Ireland has produced, admits that it was St. Patrick that introduced the knowledge of letters among the Irish. Now as St. Patrick did not land in Ireland till the year 431 after Christ, it follows that there can be no Irish history of an earlier date than that year. The truth is that there is no Irish history in existence written before the tenth century. Tighearnach and Marianus Scotus may be considered as the founders of the school of Irish annalists; the first of these died in the year 1088, and the latter in the year 1086. But even if the history of Ireland had been written as early as the days of St. Patrick, it would be utterly impossible to give an account of things which had happened at as early a period as the time of the Assyrian captivity. It would puzzle our best Canadian historians to give an account of the loves and wars and expeditions of the Indians in this country not only 1152 years ago, but even 400 years ago. How then could we expect an Irish annalist writing in St. Patrick's day, and having neither books nor monuments to help him to write an authentic history of Ireland from his own time back to the days of Jeremiah? D'Arcy McGee in his very interesting "Popular History of Ireland" speaks of "what the old bards and story-tellers have handed down concerning the history of Ireland before it became Christian," that is before St. Patrick's day, as "wild and uncertain traditions of which we have neither documentary nor monumental evidence." It is gross ignorance, not only of the history of Ireland but of general history, that would lead any one to suppose that we have reliable information about what took place in Ireland 721 B. C. We have not even the slightest evidence that the existence of Ireland was at that period known to the civilized world.

It is a sure thing that Hebrew was not spoken in Ireland in St. Patrick's day. How Mr. Hine knows that it was spoken there 1152 years before his day, it is difficult to say.

It may be useful to give a brief sketch of the history of Ireland according to the historians upon whom Mr. Hine relies for his facts. Ireland then, according to these historians, was uninhabited until the year 2025 B. C. In that year, and on 14th of May, Partholan, a wicked Greek who had murdered his father and mother, landed on the coast of Munster. He had with him 1,000 soldiers and some women. His race was wholly cut off by pestilence 300 years after his arrival. Nemedius, also a Greek, and the eleventh in descent from Noah, arrived about thirty years after the descendants of Partholan had perished. His posterity were greatly troubled by African pirates, and had to leave the country. Under the guidance of Simon Breac, or speckled Simon, they steered for Greece. The next settlers of Ireland were the Firbolgs. They were from Greece and were the descendants of Simon Breac.

The Firbolgs were displaced by the Tuatha de Danann. They too were Greeks. They went, however, from Greece to Denmark, where they lived for some time. From Denmark they came to Scotland, and from Scotland to Ireland. They landed in Ireland some time before the days of Moses. They were great necromancers. They could quell storms,

cure diseases, and foretell events; they could also restore to life those who had fallen in battle, and bring them into the field the next day. They were mighty warriors. They slew 100,000 of the Firbolgs in one battle. They carried a wonderful stone with them from Denmark; it was called *lia fail*, or the stone of destiny. They used it to crown their kings upon it. The Gael were the fifth and last colonist of Ireland. They were descended from Gathelus, the son of a king of Scythia by Scota a daughter of Pharaoh. This Gathelus was a very great parsonage. He lived in Egypt in the time of Moses, and was on very intimate terms with the great prophet and legislator of the Jews. His descendants went from Egypt to Spain and lived in that country for quite a time. From Spain under Heber and Heremon, two sons of King Milésius, they went to Ireland in the year 1300 B. C. They conquered the Tuatha de Danann quite easily in spite of all their knowledge of the black art.

The fabulous history of Ireland, or according to Hine, the true history, may be found very fully in Dr. Keating's History of Ireland. McGee gives a very brief sketch of it.

From the account of the settlement of Ireland which I have just given it will be seen that there is a slight chronological difficulty in making the Tuatha de Danann the tribe of Dan. The Tuatha de Danann arrived in Ireland in the year 1300 B. C., whilst the tribe of Dan had not left Judea till the year 721 B. C. I believe, however, that the Hinites never allow dates to stand in their way; they brush them aside like cobwebs.

The word tuath in Irish means people; tuatha or tuathan being the nominative plural; the word de means of; and the word danann may mean Dane-Island; thus it is probable that the words Tuatha de Danaann literally mean, the peoples or hordes of Daneland. Whatever Danaann means it cannot mean simply Dan; the latter half of the word *ann*, must have some meaning. What then does *ann* mean? It may unquestionably be the same as *inn*; for it is a rule in Irish orthography that a broad vowel in one syllable must be followed by a broad vowel in the next, and a small vowel followed by a small vowel. The broad vowels are *a, o, u*; the small *e, i*. And what does *inn* mean? It is a contraction for *innis*, an island or grazing ground. Erin, properly Eirinn means Iar-Innis, west-island. That Danaann means Dane-island is probable however not only on etymological grounds, but from the fact that the Irish Bards always represent the Tuatha de Danann as coming from Denmark. It may of course be said that Denmark is not an island. It may not be exactly an island; but it was far more likely that an ancient Irish Bard would speak of it as an island than that a modern D. D. would say that Tuatha de Danaann means the tribe of Dan.

The people of the North of Ireland are a mixed race, being descended from the original Celtic inhabitants of the country, and the Scottish and English colonists who crossed over to Ireland in the reign of James I. They have good blood in their veins, but it is not Hebrew blood. A. M.

VI.

THE CANAANITES.

1. The Celts of Ireland, Mr. Hine tells us, are Canaanites. He proves

this to his own satisfaction from prophecy, philology, and history,—three things of which he knows nothing.

Hine's prophetic proof of the Canaanitish origin of the Irish is this: "The Canaanites were to be thorns to the Israelites, the Irish Fenians are thorns to the English; therefore the Irish, especially the Fenians are Canaanites." It seems to me that there are some weak points in this argument. In the first place it takes for granted that the Canaanites were to be thorns in the sides of the Israelites, not only in Judea, but in other countries; and also that the English are Israelites. In the second place it proves too much. Using the same species of reasoning, we may say, the Canaanites were to be thorns to the Israelites; the Indians are thorns to the Yankees, Israelites of the tribe of Manasseh; therefore the Indians especially Sitting Bull and his braves, are Canaanites.

Let us now look at Hine's philological and historical proofs of the Canaanitish origin of the Irish.

The Irish and the Phœnician alphabet he says consist of the same number of letters, namely sixteen. Any person who will take the trouble of looking into O'Reilly's Irish English Dictionary will find that there are seventeen letters in the Irish alphabet, namely, *a, b, c, d, e, f, g, i, l, m, n, o, p, r, s, t, u*. *H* is not admitted to the dignity of a letter; it is used only as an aspirate. The Phœnician like the Hebrew alphabet consists of twenty-two letters, not of sixteen. Prof. Whitney of Yale College, an eminent philologist, in his very valuable work, "Language and the Study of Language," says: "The Phœnician alphabet was a system of twenty-two signs, all of them possessing consonantal value. It was strictly and exclusively a phonetic system. It received from the Greeks its final perfection. To the Greek alphabet the early Celtic modes of writing trace their origin, mainly through the Latin." Page 462.

No doubt some Irish fabulists assert that Nial, the father of the great Gathelus, "by the assistance of two excellent scholars invented the Hebrew, Greek, Latin and Irish alphabets." The same fabulists also tell us that Ireland was distinguished for its schools and colleges ages before St. Patrick was born. That Irish monks who were good scholars and had nothing to do should write fables is not to be wondered at, but that men of sense should believe these fables to be historical facts is something astonishing. If the Irish had letters and a written literature before the days of St. Patrick, how comes it that the Irish words for books, pens, reading, writing, and letters are all of Latin origin.

The Irish language we are gravely told is "identical with the Phœnician." All scholars know that the Phœnician and the Hebrew, though different dialects, may be regarded as the same language. Augustine, who lived among the Phœnicians of Carthage says:—"The Hebrew and the Phœnician languages differ very little from one another." Whitney says, "The Phœnicians spoke a dialect so nearly akin with the Hebrew that its scanty remains are read with no great difficulty by the aid of that language." Page 295. Now no sane man who can speak the Celtic language and spell his way through the Hebrew Bible will say that the Irish and the Hebrew are identical; the former belongs to the Indo-European family of languages; the latter to the Semitic family. A man may be a good Hebrew scholar, and not be able to read one word of Irish.

Hine's historic proof of the identity of the Irish with the Canaanites

consists merely in the following assertion:—"There can be no doubt that the Irish are Canaanites; their own history and legends fairly prove this." It is a great pity that Hine did not condescend to name the history which proves this theory. I hope it is not a story-book.

Hine in trying to prove the Canaanitish origin of the Irish takes for granted that the Canaanites and the Phœnicians were the same people. It is almost certain that they were not the same people. We have every reason to believe that the Phœnicians were a Semitic race; whilst we know that the Canaanites were descended from Ham. According to Herodotus the Phœnicians came from the Persian Gulf. Prof. Rawlinson stoutly maintains that the Canaanites and the Phœnicians were two distinct races, "the former being the original inhabitants of the country, and the latter being emigrants at a comparatively recent date." Herodotus vol. IV. page 199. Origin of Nations, page 199.

That the Irish are Celts is an unquestionable fact. That the Celts of Britain and Ireland came from Gaul all rational historians admit. That Ireland was peopled not directly from Gaul but from Scotland cannot very well be doubted. A learned Irishman, Dr. O'Brien, Bishop of Cloyne says,—“Mr. Lhuyd gives good ground to think that the first Celts who came to Ireland arrived there, not immediately from Gaul, but rather after remaining for some tract of time in the greater British isle.” Gibbon in his own way of putting things says,—“It is probable that in some remote period of antiquity, the fertile plains of Ulster received a colony of hungry Scots.” Vol. II. page 564.

The Irish would have no reason to be ashamed of a Phœnician origin; neither would they have any cause to be proud of an Israelitish origin. Morally the Phœnicians were not much inferior to the ten tribes, especially at the time of their captivity; intellectually they were at least equal to them. Let the Irish rest satisfied with being what they are, chiefly Celts, descendants neither of Shem nor of Ham, but of Japheth. The Irish Celts were a noble race, distinguished both for their learning and their bravery. Any nation might be proud of the battle of Clontarf.

“Let Erin remember the days of old,
Ere her faithless sons betrayed her;
When Malachi wore the collar of gold
Which he won from the proud invader;
When her kings with standard of green unfurled
Led the Red Branch Knights to danger:
Ere the emerald gem of the western world
Was set in the crown of a stranger.”

2. It is well known that the Irish and the Highlanders are of the same stock. They speak the same language, and call themselves by the same name, Gael. If then the Irish are Canaanites the Highlanders must also be Canaanites.

Highlanders attention! Let me speak a few words to those of you who have an itching after Hinism.

My dear friends, what do you mean? Hine does not say that you are Israelites; he looks upon you as wicked worthless Canaanites who are fit for nothing but to be trampled upon. Do you believe you are what he thinks? If so, go and be slaves to your lawful masters. It is a pity you would not see yourselves as others see you. You cut a very ridiculous figure as you go hopping about, slapping your hands, and straining your

lungs shouting, "Halloo for the Israelites! Great are the Anglo-Saxons!" Don't you know you are Celts? You are neither Israelites, Canaanites, nor Saxons. Why do you wish to be Israelites? Are you ashamed of your race? If so, it is because you are ignorant of its history. The Celts were the first race that entered Europe from western Asia. Long before the Christian era, they had settled France, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, the valley of the Po, parts of Germany and Switzerland, and England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. As soldiers no people have ever surpassed them. Under Brennus in the year 390 B. C., they laid Rome in ashes. In the year 270 B. C. they passed through Macedonia and made themselves masters of Galatia. If Cæsar conquered Gallia it was not because the Gauls were not brave, but because the Romans were better disciplined and better armed. Any nation might be proud of such commanders as Caractacus, Galgacus, Wallace, Marshal McDonald, Sir Colin Campbell, Marshal MacMahon, and General Grant. But in the arts of peace as well as those of war the Celts have distinguished themselves. As missionaries, travellers, writers and statesmen we find men of Celtic blood occupy the highest positions. You know that all the Macs and O's are Celts, whether born in the Lowlands of Scotland, the island of Cape Breton, or Timbuctoo. St. Patrick, Columba and Dr. Duff were Celts. MacClure, McClintock, Ross, and Livingstone were Celts. John Owen, MacLaurin, and Norman Macleod were Celts. O'sian and Thomas Campbell were Celts. Ferguson and Sir Roderick Murchison were Celts. Buchanan, Robertson, and Macaulay were Celts. And Sir James Mackintosh, O'Connell, and McGee were Celts. Perhaps you have heard of Sir John A. Macdonald, the Premier of the Dominion, and the skilful manager of the conservative party! He is a pure Celt. His able rival, Alexander Mackenzie, the leader of the opposition, is also a Celt. Know too that Lord Lorne, young Mac Cailean Mor, the Governor General of this great Dominion, is a Celt.

As then you have no reason to be ashamed of your race, give up your nonsense. Blow no longer about your Israelitish origin. Stand by your true colors.

"Triumphant be the thistle still unfurled,
Dear symbol wild! on freedom's hills it grows,
Where Fingal stemmed the tyrants of the world,
And Roman eagles found unconquered foes."

As Donald Turk was one day standing at the door before a big spruce stick his neighbor came along and said to him, "What are going to make of that stick?" "I am going to make a pig trough of it," he answered, "and I am going to make it all out of my own head." That is just the way in which Hine made his theory. I question, however, if it is as useful as Donald's trough would be.

A. M.

VII.

THE WELSH.

The Hinites maintain that the Welsh are the tribe of Simeon. Hine's account of the people of Wales is as follows:—"The tribes of Dan and Simeon were not carried away into Assyria; they escaped to

the Anglo-Saxons, the
lites, Canaanites,
you ashamed of
its history. The
rn Asia. Long
Portugal, Bel-
erland, and Eng-
le have ever sur-
ey laid Rome in
edonia and made
a it was not be-
ere better disci-
ch commanders
r Colin Camp-
arts of peace
elves. As mis-
f Celtic blood
s and O's are
d of Cape Bre-
were Celts.
John Owen,
Thomas Camp-
were Celts.
James Mack-
e heard of Sir
ilful manager
al, Alexander
now too that
of this great

ive up your
nd by your

big spruce
g to make
answered,
s just the
is as use-
A. M.

tribes
ped to

Britain and Ireland in ships. Is. 66: 19. Obadiah, 14th verse. The tribe of Dan settled in the north of Ireland, and the tribe of Simeon on the west coast of Scotland. The Simeonites not liking Scotland continued migrating towards the South, and finally settled in Wales. The Welsh people are pure Israelites."

If assertions were proofs Hine and his followers would prove anything. There is not the slightest foundation for the supposition that the Welsh are of an Israelitish origin; it is indeed certain that they are not.

The Bible tells us that Shalmaneser "carried Israel away into Assyria." It is not stated that any tribe escaped. The 66th chapter of Isaiah refers to things which were to happen, not at the time of the destruction of the Kingdom of the ten tribes, but after the return of the Jews from Babylon. Surely the Hinites will not affirm that by Tarshish, Pul and Lud, and Tubul and Javan we are to understand Ireland and Wales. Obadiah who probably lived in the time of the Babylonian captivity denounces the Edomites for opposing the escape of the house of Judah, not for opposing the escape of members of the Kingdom of the ten tribes. 12th, 13th, and 14th verses.

We have no account in any history extant of the arrival of a colony of Israelites in Ireland, or Scotland, or Wales, either before or since the Christian era. The traditions of the Welsh do not in any way connect them with the ten tribes.

It will be admitted by sober-minded men and Hinites alike that the ancestors of the present inhabitants of Wales were in Britain nineteen hundred years ago. Julius Cæsar who landed in Britain 55 years B. C. found the whole country thickly settled. His words are,—“There is a countless multitude of persons in Britain.” Tacitus who wrote his life of Agricola about ninety years after Christ informs us that the Britons of Wales were divided into two tribes; the Silures who inhabited South Wales and the Ordovices who inhabited North Wales. At the time of the Saxon invasion multitudes of Britons from all parts of England flocked into Wales. The Welsh bravely maintained their independence against the whole power of England until the time of Edward I. They were conquered in the year 1282, thirty-two years before the battle of Bannockburn.

That the people who lived in Wales in the days of Cæsar were of the same race with the people who lived in other parts of south Britain cannot be denied. They all spoke the same language, believed the same superstitions, and observed the same sacred rites.

But from what country did the Britons come? Did they come from the opposite coast of Gaul, or did they come from Judea? It would be natural to suppose that they came from Gaul. History, ethnology, and philology prove that they came from Gaul. Cæsar in his account of Britain says —“The buildings of the Britons are almost similar to those of the Gauls. The Britons do not think it lawful to taste the hare, the hen, or the goose. Of all the Britons the most civilized are those who live in Kent, they do not differ much in their manners from the Gauls. The greater part of those in the interior of the country do not sow, they live on milk and flesh, and clothe themselves with skins. Almost all the Britons paint themselves with woad. They have long hair and do not shave their upper lip.” Cæsar's Gallic War Book V: 12-14. Tacitus in his life of Agri-

cola says :—" It is to be believed that the Gauls occupied the neighboring British soil. You find among the Britons the sacred rites of the Gauls. The language of the Gauls and Britons differs very little." Chapter 11th. Druidism which prevailed in Gaul and Britain proves that the people of the two countries were of the same race. The Welsh look upon themselves as descendants of the ancient Britons, and believe that their forefathers came from Guel.

It is well known that the Celts of Gaul were not Israelites. Hine himself will not say that they were. The Jews are descendants of Shem ; the Celts according to Josephus are descendants of Gomer, the son of Japhet. How the Celts of Wales can be Israelites, the Celts of Ireland Canaanites, and the Celts of France some other race, it is very difficult to conceive. Of course the Hinites do not try to understand and reconcile things ; their motto is *B lieve*. It is certainly our duty to believe things upon good authority whether we understand them or not, but it cannot surely be our duty to believe upon the assertion of uninformed enthusiasts either things which contradict known facts or things which cannot be shown to be based upon facts.

The Celts in their migrations from Western Asia to Western Europe became divided into two great branches ; the Gael and the Cymry. The Gael represented by the Highlanders and Irish, were the first to enter Britain ; the Cymrij, represented by the Welsh followed them. The Cymry are no doubt the same people as the Cimmerians—Rawlinson's Herodotus, Vol. III, page 150. But the Cimmerians were a powerful nation in Europe in the days of Homer. He speaks of them at the beginning of the eleventh book of his *Odyssey*. He represents them as living so far west that the sun never reached them. But Homer lived at least eight hundred and fifty years before Christ or more than one hundred years before the tribes had been carried away into captivity in Assyria. If then the Welsh people are Cimmerians, they cannot be Israelites. A.M.

VIII.

THE ORIGIN OF THE SAXONS.

The chief plank in the theory of the Hinites is that the Anglo-Saxons were the lineal descendants of the tribes which had been carried away captives into Assyria. Their arguments in support of this view may be thus summed up :—(1) " The second race of people that settled in Europe was the Scythian, the Celtic being the first. The Scythians were first heard of in Asia in the region of the river Araxes. The Saxons were a Scythian tribe. They are the same people as the Sacae, Sakai, Sacas-sani, or Saka-Suna. Now as it was to the Araxes the ten tribes had been carried away, it is plain that they are the Sacae of profane history. The very word Saxon which is the same as Sacae means Isaac's son. (2) The Saxons, Sacae, or Scythians made their first appearance in Media in the region of the Araxes at the exact period of the Assyrian captivity. This we learn from Homer and Herodotus. (3) Media was not the cradle, or original country of the Scythians, Sacae, or Saxons. They came from some other country, of course the ten tribes came from Palestine."

With regard to the time at which the Anglo-Saxons or the ten tribes

left Asia for the British Isles, Hine writes as follows:—"In the days of Christ our forefathers were occupying the north-west of Asia, and on the point of making their way into Europe. The apostles found them located in Cappadocia, Galatia, Pamphylia, Lydia, Bithynia, Mysia, Achaia, Thessaly, Macedonia, and Illyricum. In obedience to the command in Matt. 10: 5 the apostles after the day of Pentecost labored among them. Josephus testifies that in his day they were still beyond the Euphrates. The cause of their being so long in the region of Media was that they were waiting for redemption from the Mosaic law. The apostles found them with their synagogues and clinging to the institutions of Moses. In order that they might lose their identity, Paul commanded them to give up circumcision and genealogical distinctions. 1 Cor. 7: 19. Titus 3: 9. The Epistle to the Galatians, the two Epistles of Peter, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistle of James were all written to the ten tribes."

Let us now examine Hine's statements respecting the origin of the Anglo-Saxons. Is his theory based upon facts? Is it a pure supposition? Or is it in direct opposition to well-known facts? What is there really in it?

I admit that the Celts and Scythians both had their origin in Western Asia. If they are descended from Noah they must have come from that quarter.

The ten tribes were carried away for rebellion as captives into Assyria in the year 721 B. C. They were placed in small batches here and there throughout the Assyrian Empire. 2 Kings 17: 6 and 18: 11. 1 Chron. 5: 26. The Books of Kings were probably written by Jeremiah, and cannot be of an earlier date than the time of the Babylonian captivity, 606 B. C. The Books of Chronicles it is generally believed were compiled by Ezra. But whoever compiled them they cannot be of an earlier date than 536 B. C., the year in which Cyrus issued his decree for rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem. Now we know when the books of Kings and Chronicles were written that the ten tribes were captives in the very places to which the Kings of Assyria had brought them. 2 Kings 17: 23. 1 Chron. 5: 26. We know further that when Josephus wrote his antiquities, 93 years after Christ, they were still in Assyria. The words of the great Jewish historian are,—“There are but two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans, while the ten tribes are beyond the Euphrates till now, and are an immense multitude and not to be estimated by numbers.” Antiq. 11: 2.

No man who knew what he was writing about would quote Homer in proof of the identity of the Scythians and the ten tribes. The great bard was in his grave over one hundred years before the Assyrian captivity.

Herodotus who finished his history about the year 430 B. C. gives a very full account of the Scythians. They were in his day a powerful nation occupying the region of the country between the Danube and the Don. A vast horde of them under their King Madyes had passed out of Europe into Asia Minor in the year 638 B. C. They defeated the Medes in battle, and remained in their country plundering and oppressing for twenty-eight years. They were overcome by Cyaxerxes in the year 610 B. C. and compelled to return to their own country. In the year 514 B. C. Darius with a large army invaded Scythia.

When now we compare the facts stated by the writers of Kings and

Chronicles respecting the ten tribes and the facts stated by Herodotus respecting the Scythians, is it possible for us to believe that they were the same people? How could the Israelites be captives in Assyria in 606 B. C. and in 536 B. C., and at the same time be a great nation north of the Black Sea? Or how could they be captives and masters in Media at the same period?

A very eminent historian in speaking of the Scythians says:—"We find reason to suspect that they were crushed between their two neighbors, the Getae and the Sarmatians. In vain we look for their descendants at the present day." Rawlinson's Herodotus, vol. III. 168.

The Sacae were not the ten tribes. Herodotus says that Sacae is the name which the Persians give to all Scythians. Sacia, or the country of the Sacae formed one of the twenty satrapies into which the empire of Darius was divided. It was east of the Bolor range, and is known at the present day as Cashgar and Yarkand. The Sacae were very good soldiers. They fought bravely at the battle of Marathon. They invaded India in the year 56 B. C.

The Anglo-Saxons cannot be regarded as the ten tribes. It is simply absurd to speak of them as such.

The Germanic tribes that crossed over to England were the Jutes or Got from Jutland, the Saxons, and the Angles. They were under the leadership of two sanguinary chieftains, Hengist and Horsa. The Jutes occupied Kent, the Saxons the midland countries of England, and the Angles the portion of England north of the Humber and the south of Scotland. The Angles were the most numerous and gave their name to the country. It was about the year 449 after Christ that Hengist and Horsa invaded England. The Jutes, Saxons and Angles were all barbarians and idolaters.

Tacitus is the earliest writer who mentions the Angles. He says that they worshipped Hertha or mother earth. *De Germania*, 40. Of course he regarded them, and speaks of them as a German tribe.

If the Angles were beyond the Euphrates when Josephus wrote his *Antiquities* in A. D. 93, how did they come to be settled down in Germany when Tacitus wrote his *Germania* in A. D. 100? Again if they were Christians when they left Asia, how did they come to be ignorant idolaters when they arrived in Europe in the course of six or seven years? No doubt the Hinites can easily answer both these questions.

It is wholly impossible to trace back the Jutes, Saxons, or Angles to any particular nation or tribe in Asia. This difficulty arises from the fact that the Germans, prior to the introduction of Christianity, had no literature. Tacitus says—"Their men and women alike are ignorant of the secrets of letters." *Germania* 19.

What a careless people the German Israelites were. They could read Paul's letters when they left Asia yet when Tacitus wrote his history, they did not know their alphabet!

The Hinites of course deny that the Jutes, Saxons and Angles were Germans; they were Israelites who passed through Germany. Germans or not they considered themselves Germans, looked liked the Germans, spoke the same language with them, lived in the same way, observed the same laws, and worshipped the same gods with them. All historians from Tacitus down to Edward Freeman have regarded them as Germans.

That intelligent men who read, or ought to read history, can persuade themselves that they were Israelites is one of the mysteries of the age.

The Germans, the Jutes, Saxons and Angles included, had been for a long time in western Europe even in the days of Julius Cæsar. This is evident from the account given of them both by Cæsar and Tacitus.

Saxons, Saxons, don't be ashamed of Germany. Remember it is the land of Luther, Kepler, Goethe, Kant, Richter, Von Moltke, and Bismarck. A. M.

IX.

THE NORMANS; WHO WERE THEY?

It is firmly believed by the Hinites that the Normans who invaded England under William the Conqueror were the tribe of Benjamin.

Hine has written a vast amount of nonsense about the tribe of Benjamin; stuff which no intelligent man can believe. His account of it is substantially as follows:—"Benjamin is a tribe of Israel, one of the ten, and not a tribe of the Kingdom of Judah. It was not one tribe out of the twelve that was promised to Rehoboam, but one tribe out of the ten which belonged to Israel. There were not ten tribes under Jeroboam, nor in the Kingdom of Israel at any time. There were only seven tribes carried away into Assyria; the tribes of Dan and Simeon escaped to Ireland and Wales, and the tribe of Benjamin remained with Judah. The mission of the one tribe of Israel given to Rehoboam was to be a light before God. 1 Kings, 11:36. The tribe of Benjamin were a light by preaching the gospel. All the Disciples of Christ, except Judas were of this tribe. It was on the tribe of Benjamin that the Holy Spirit was poured out on the day of Pentecost. Joel's prophecy quoted by Peter in the second chapter of Acts had no reference at all to the Jews. It is a very grave mistake to speak of the followers of Christ as Jews. There was not one person of the house of Judah among his Disciples. The whole tribe of Benjamin embraced the christian religion. The Benjamites all escaped from Jerusalem sometime before its destruction by Titus. Their escape was predicted by Jeremiah. Jer. 6:1. That they escaped we learn from Josephus. Having got away from Jerusalem, they went by sea to Italy and thence by land to Normandy in France. From Normandy they crossed over to England under William the Conqueror. The men who routed the Saxons at the battle of Hastings were not Normans, but positively Israelites of the tribe of Benjamin."

The above statements taken from Hines' "Flashes of Light" are among the most ridiculous ever penned outside of a lunatic asylum.

When we consider the Jews merely as descendants of Jacob the tribe of Levi is to be counted as one of the twelve; when, however, we consider them as landowners, taxpayers and warriors we are not to regard it as one of the twelve. The twelve tribes that owned the land were the tribes of Reuben, Simeon, Judah, Issachar, Zebulon, Ephraim, Manasseh, Benjamin, Dan, Asher, Gad, and Naphtali. Numbers 1:1-47; Joshua 14:1-5. The Bible distinctly says that "the children of Joseph were two tribes, Manasseh and Ephraim." The children of Levi received no inheritance; they were not numbered among the twelve tribes; they were

wholly given up to the Lord instead of the first-born ; they were the religious teachers of the people. Numbers 1 : 47—50, 8 : 6—26, 18 : 1—23, 26 : 52—62. Deut. 10 : 8—9, 18 : 1—2. Josh. 21 : 1—42. When the division of the Kingdom of Israel took place the children of Levi were not counted as belonging either to Jeroboam or Rehoboam. They were scattered over both Kingdoms.

Benjamin was never one of the ten tribes. The Benjamites always followed the house of Judah. The one tribe given to Rehoborm could not possibly be one of the ten tribes given to Jeroboam ; it must have been one of the twelve tribes that formed the Kingdom of Solomon. When Abijah met Jeroboam he rent his new garment into twelve pieces and told him to take ten of the twelve, at the same time assuring him that God would give him ten tribes of the twelve tribes of Israel. Of the remaining two tribes Rehoboam was to have one. With respect to the other tribe God might give it either to Jeroboam or to Rehoboam as he saw proper ; He gave it to Rehoboam. 1 Kings 11 : 11—39. The one tribe specially promised to Rehoboam was the tribe of Judah, not the tribe of Benjamin. This is evident from 1 Kings 12 : 16—20. When the division took place the tribe of Benjamin cast in its lot with the house of Judah. 1 Kings 12 : 21. It is outrageous to affirm that there were not ten tribes under Jeroboam. God always fulfils his promises, and the promise to Jeroboam was, "I will give ten tribes to thee." Josephus says that God promised Rehoboam "one tribe with that which was next to it" and Jeroboam ten tribes. He also says that the tribe of Judah and that of Benjamin ordained Rehoboam King, but that the rest of the people appointed Jeroboam to be their king. Antiquities 8 : 7 : 8 and 8 : 8 : 3.

Hines interpretation of 1 Kings 11 : 36 is intensely ridiculous. The tribe referred to is the tribe of Judah. The thing promised is that David's descendants would continue to rule in Jerusalem. 1 Kings 15 : 4. 2 Kings 8 : 19. 2 Chron. 21 : 7.

We have no proof that the Apostles were all of the tribe of Benjamin except Judas ; it is probable that they belonged to different tribes. There is no ground for supposing that no members of the tribe of Judah embraced the gospel. The Jews of the tribe of Judah were no worse than the Jews of the tribe of Benjamin. If the Saviour wept over Jerusalem, prayed for those who were putting Him to death, died for His enemies, and commanded His Disciples to preach the gospel in Jerusalem, what right have the Hinites to say that He would not pour out his Spirit upon men who belonged to the tribe of Judah ? The descendants of Levi were especially bitter in their opposition to Christ, yet we find that Barnabas who was one of them was a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith. Acts 4 : 36 and 11 : 24. It is not on account of our goodness or innocence that we are saved, but because God is infinitely merciful. The men of Judah were in every respect better than the men of Israel. They maintained the true worship of God among them until the Messiah came.

The Hinites represent themselves as the only enlightened christians in the world. "We are the men," is their everlasting song, "we are the men and wisdom shall die with us." It is strange if they are the clear-headed and pure-hearted christians they regard themselves that they have

not a little more respect for the word of God than they have. It is wrong, they say, to speak of the first christians as Jews; they were not Jews at all, they were Israelites. They were Israelites, I admit, descendants of Jacob, but they were also Jews. The Bible speaks of them as Jews. John 11: 45 and 12: 11. Acts 14: 1, 17: 1-4, 18: 2 and 24, 22: 3. Gal. 2: 11-16. The Hinites may go on raving about the distinction between the Jews and the Israelites, but those who believe the New Testament will still be of opinion that the Saviour and his Apostles regarded all the Israelites in their day as Jews.

That "Joel does not prophesy of the Jews at all" is a very daring assumption. The truth is that Joel's prophecies from beginning to end have reference to the Jews. Joel 2: 1, 23, 32 and 3: 1. Peter unquestionably thought Joel prophesied respecting the Jews; if not some of his statements are very strange. Let us look at his sermon on the day of Pentecost. He begins by addressing the men of Judea and all that dwelt in Jerusalem. He tells them that what they witnessed was the thing spoken of by the prophet Joel. He calls them men of Israel and charges them with having crucified the Saviour. He urges them to repent and be baptized and promises them the gift of the Holy Ghost. If Peter was a Hinite is it not strange that he regarded the expressions "men of Judea" and "men of Israel" as synonymous? Is it not also strange that he charged the men of Israel with crucifying the Saviour? Acts 2: 22-23, 3: 12-15. We are informed that some of the very men whom Peter charged with having killed the Prince of Life were saved. Acts 2: 41. How then can it be maintained that no Jews were converted on the day of Pentecost?

How the Hinites have found out that the whole tribe of Benjamin embraced the christian religion it is impossible to conceive. The only rational supposition is that they are wholly indebted to their imagination for their facts.

There is no such prediction in Jeremiah as that the tribe of Benjamin would escape from Jerusalem at the time of the Roman seige. The reference in Jer. 6: 1 is to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. The prophet had good reasons for calling upon the children of Benjamin to escape out of Jerusalem. Probably one half of the people in Jerusalem belonged to the tribe of Benjamin. Besides Jeremiah had been brought up among the Benjamites.

We are nowhere told that the tribe of Benjamin escaped from Jerusalem at the time of the Roman seige. Had such a thing happened Josephus would certainly have mentioned it. The Benjamites fought like brave men, and suffered precisely the same fate with the Judahites. Eusebius tells us that the Christians escaped from Jerusalem. He says they fled to Pella at the northern extremity of Perea. He did not know however that they went to Italy. It was Hine that found that out.

The assertion that the Normans came from Palestine by way of Italy and France is directly in the teeth of well-known historical facts. The Germany of the Romans included, not only the country at present called by that name, but also Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. The Germans and Scandinavians were originally the same people. The roving tribes in Norway formed themselves into a kingdom in A. D. 870 under Harold, the Fair-haired. The Norwegians, Swedes and Danes were known at

that time in the civilized portions of Europe as Normans or Northmen. A band of Normans, under Rollo, a young Norwegian chief, settled in France about the year 898. They named the place in which they settled Normandy. They were all Pagans. They intermarried with the original Celtic inhabitants, and embraced the Christian religion. They learned to speak the French language; their children had no knowledge of Scandinavian. Their descendants, partly of Scandinavian or German origin and partly of Celtic origin, were a very active race of men. In 1066 they crossed over into England under William the Conqueror and defeated the Saxons at the battle of Hastings.

We now see that the Normans, instead of being Israelites, were descendants of those whom Cæsar and Tacitus called Germans. Authentic history traces their origin, not to a people who lived beyond the Euphrates in the days Josephus, but to a people who were at that time chasing wild beasts in the forests of Scandinavia, or learning to paddle canoes.

A. M.

X.

MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS.

1. Hine makes the following astounding statements respecting the looks of the Jews:—"The ten tribes never bore the features of the present Jews. Until the time of the Roman siege the people of Judah and Israel were the same in appearance. It was owing to the sin of crucifying the Saviour that the physical type of the Jews underwent a change. This is clear from Isaiah 3: 9. It is more than probable that the Israelites, the ten tribes, have retained to this day their original cast of countenance."

The statement in Isaiah 3: 9, "The show of their countenance doth witness against them," simply means that the look of the proud and haughty among the Jews would correspond to their inner character. That no change has come over the physical appearance of the Jews is certain from the fact that the Jews of the tribe of Judah and Levi which go peddling up and down through the country have the very looks of the Jews who lived in the time of Moses, as is evident from ancient Egyptian and Assyrian monuments. If the ten tribes have retained to this day their original cast of countenance, and if they are the English people, it must follow that the English look like the Israelites of the Egyptian monuments. The English, however, do not resemble the Israelites of the monuments; it must be then that they are not Israelites, or else that a great change has come over their looks. As, however, the present Jews resemble the Jews or Israelites of the monuments, Hine's theory of a change in the looks of the Jews since the destruction of Jerusalem must be a fiction.

2. Some ignoramus has told Hine that the English language is derived from the Hebrew and the Sanskrit.

The languages of the world may be divided into several classes. The two most important classes are the Indo-European and the Semitic. The Indo-European class includes the languages of India, the Persian, the Greek, the Latin, the Slavonic, the Germanic and the Celtic. The Sanskrit is one of the languages of India. The English, so far as structure is concerned, is the same as the old Saxon, and is a Germanic dialect. The

Sanskrit, however, cannot be spoken of as the mother of the Germanic family of languages; it is only its sister. The Hebrew belongs to the Semitic family of languages, and is wholly unlike English.

3. Hine asserts that the fact that many surnames of Hebrew origin are found in England goes for to prove that the English are Israelites.

If Mr. Hine will show that Hebrew names were quite common among the Saxons before they became acquainted with the Bible I will admit that there is some force in his argument. That there are families of Jewish origin in England no one will deny. Hebrew names, however, are not so common in England as Hine thinks. Alexander, Demetrius, Stephen, Philip, Peter and Timothy are Greek names. Claudius, Marcus, and Lucius are Latin names.

4. Hine takes for granted that the people of Britain have become thoroughly united and from this supposition argues that the Celts, the Danes, the Saxons, and the Normans must all be of the same race.

It is not a fact that the Irish, the Welsh, the Scotch, and the English have become thoroughly blended into one. Even if it were a fact it would not follow that they were Israelites. The Celts, the Romans, the Franks, and the Normans of France have become at least as much united as the different races of Britain, yet Hine will not admit that the French are Israelites. He thinks it would be a most unchristian thing to allow the Celts of France to have the same blessings in this world that the English have. The amalgamation argument, it is evident, has no force in it.

5. The Hinites make a great ado about weights and measures. The heathen, they say, had only a profane system invented by themselves; whilst the Hebrews had a sacred system, a system given them from Heaven. The ark, the tabernacle in the wilderness and Solomon's temple were all built according to the sacred measure. The Great Pyramid was erected according to the same measure. The English inch, foot, ell, and mile are the same as the sacred Hebrew measures. The English quarter is just a quarter of what the ark of the covenant would contain.

Whatever Hine and his faithful followers may imagine and assert, all historians believe that the forefathers of the Saxons, Jutes, and Angles who took possession of England were in Germany in the days of Cæsar, and that they were among those whom that historian calls Germans. Now if the German tribes of Saxons, Jutes, and Angles were so intimately acquainted with measures of distances as Hine's theory would lead us to suppose, is it not very strange that Cæsar penned the following sentence,—“The breadth of the Hercynian woods extends to a speedy journey of nine days; for it cannot be measured otherwise as the Germans do not know measures of journeys.” *De Bello Gallico; Liber VI, chap. 25.*

In a book to which almost every person has access, Collier's History of the British Empire, we find it stated that in the reign of Henry I “a standard of weights and measures was established, the ell being fixed at the length of the King's arm.” Strange that a king of the tribe of Benjamin and a fine scholar should have meddled with the old sacred weights and measures of the Saxons! Stranger still that the arm of such a profane meddler should be a sacred measure! King Henry's arm must have been almost as wonderful an object as the great pyramid itself.

Smith's Bible Dictionary, edited by Hackett, is the best work of its kind in the English language. It was prepared by some of the most

eminent scholars in Britain and the United States. Now in this work, in the article on Weights and Measures, I find the following statements:—
 "The cubit, which may be regarded as the standard measure, was of varying length. It denotes in the ordinary sense of the term the distance between the elbow and the extremity of the middle finger. Cubits were not regarded in the light of sacred and profane."

—Any person who will look into Webster's Dictionary will find that the English quarter is the quarter of a ton, or eight bushels of such good heavy wheat as grew before Hine and the weevil came into existence.

But I must stop. To be refuting Hine's vagaries seems like proving that the moon is not made of green cheese. If any man thinks he is an Israelite let him think so. Nebuchadnezzar believed he was an ox.—A. M.

XI.

THE EVILS OF HINISM.

There are various evils in connection with Hinism. A few of them I will point out.

1. Hinism is a huge falsehood, and belief in what is false as true is necessarily injurious. The freer the mind is from error the better does it act.

2. Hinism tends to weaken the power of reasoning. It separates knowledge from faith. It asks you to believe without giving you any grounds for believing. Its nature is thus to make men superstitious.

3. Hinism begets selfishness, pride, and vanity. It is pharisaism in a modern dress. Its chief votaries look upon themselves as the special favorites of Heaven. The Germans and the French they regard as miserable Gentiles; the world they think was made for the Anglo-Saxons, especially for those of them who are fortunate enough to know their origin.

4. Hinism tends to prevent missionary operations. Christ commanded his apostles to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, but the Hinites say it is absurd to preach the gospel to the Jews.

5. Hinism contradicts the teachings of the Bible respecting the outpouring of the spirit. The Bible represents God as giving his spirit in his mercy where and when He pleases. Hinism makes the outpouring of the spirit dependent upon our acknowledging ourselves as the ten tribes. Hine's words are,—“The promised outpouring upon Israel will be given to us in England immediately upon our recognizing our identity. It is a glory attached to the identity and can never be realized before.”

6. Hinism misrepresents the object of the Saviour's coming into the world. “It was Christ's great mission,” says Hine, to “redeem Israel. He came to redeem Israel, the ten tribes, but not Judah, the two tribes. If he had come for the latter he would have run counter to the prophets. If the Jews of our day compose the whole twelve tribes, as Dr. Talbot says; then would his mission have been a total failure. He came purposely for the ten tribes, and directed his apostles and disciples where to find them, and Paul went straight to them.”

The teachings of the Holy Spirit respecting the mission of Christ to the world are very different from those of Hine and his followers. That the Jews in their blindness and pride believed that the special work of the

Messiah would be to benefit them, I do not deny. Many of them were quite as ignorant of the meaning of the Bible as the Hinite leaders themselves. According to the first proclamation of the gospel the Son of Man was to come to the world to bruise the serpent's head. According to the Saviour himself He came to the world that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life. Paul never thought that it was to save the ten tribes Christ came. "This is a faithful saying," he says "and worthy of all acceptance that Christ Jesus came into world to save sinners."

The special work of Christ on earth was neither to teach nor bestow salvation, but to give his life as a ransom, and by his death to procure salvation for his people. "Christ loved the church and gave himself for it," not for the ten tribes.

The great commission of Christ to his apostles was, not to preach the gospel either to the ten or the two, or the twelve tribes; but to all men. "All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth; go ye therefore and teach all nations." Matt. 28:19. The apostles began their labors in Jerusalem; that was proper and in accordance with the instructions of their Master. Luke 24:27. For some time indeed, even beyond Judea, in Phoenice, Cyprus, and Antioch the disciples preached the word only to the Jews. Acts 11:19.

If as the Hinites maintain the great and final commission given to the apostles was to preach the gospel to the ten tribes, and if it shows gross ignorance to speak of the ten tribes as Jews, how does it happen that the inspired historian of our church always calls the Israelites among whom the apostles and other disciples labored Jews? Acts 11:19, 13:5-43, 14:1, 17:1-5, 18:4, 19:28, 20:18-21, 28:17-24. Would the Hinites have us believe that Luke committed mistakes? Hine strenuously maintains that the devout men who were present at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost were the representatives of the ten tribes. Were I to speak of those devout men as Jews every Hinite in the country would call me an ignorant man who did not know the wonderfully important distinction between the Jews and the Israelites. Luke calls them Jews. Acts 2:5.

7. Hinism gives a grossly incorrect view of the nature of Christ's Kingdom. It represents it as to a great extent a worldly kingdom. It admits of course that German and French Christians are members of it; yet it does not give them the same privileges and blessings in it that it gives to British Christians. As there is an aristocracy in the political kingdoms of the world, so there is in Christ's Kingdom on earth, in the gospel church!

That the teachings of Hinism respecting Christ's kingdom are opposed alike to the spirit of Christianity and the express declarations of the Bible, is quite clear. Indeed Hinism has nothing of the spirit of Christianity about it. It is a revival of the old Jewish notion that the world was made for the children of Israel and that under the reign of the Messiah the Gentiles would all be slaves to them.

Christ's kingdom is wholly spiritual in its nature. It is not a kingdom of worldly riches, or power, or eminence. It is essentially different from earthly kingdoms. Matt. 13:11-44. 22:21. John 18:36. Rom. 14:17.

The terms of admission to Christ's kingdom, faith and repentance, are spiritual in their nature. Matt. 18:3. John 3:3-5. Acts 8:37-38. No

outward things such as profession, performance of duties, or natural descent will secure admission to it. Matt. 5: 20. 7: 21. Rom. 8: 20. 9: 6. Gal. 5: 6. 1 Peter 3: 21.

The members of Christ's kingdom are spiritual men, persons who have received a new nature from the Holy Ghost. Eph. 2: 19. Philip 3: 20.

Christ's kingdom is universal. It knows no political distinctions. Its members are to be found among all nations and in all parts of the world. Isa. 9: 6. Dan. 2: 44.

The blessings of Christ's kingdom are purely spiritual. They are such as pardon, sonship, and holiness. Matt. 2: 21. 3: 11. 2 Cor. 10: 4. Eph. 1: 3-8. Col. 1: 13-14. Titus 2: 14.

All the members of Christ's kingdom enjoy the same rights, privileges and blessings. Gal. 3: 27-29. Eph. 2: 11-22.

"Nothing is plainer from the teachings of scripture than that all believers are one body in Christ, that all are the partakers of the Holy Spirit, and by virtue of their union with Him are joint and equal partakers of the benefits of redemption; that if there be any difference between them, it is not in virtue of national or social distinctions, but solely of individual character and devotion. As under the old dispensation proselytes from the heathen were incorporated with the Jewish people, and all distinction between them and those who were Jews by birth was lost, so it was under the gospel. Gentiles and Jews were united in undistinguished and undistinguishable membership in the same church. It is as much opposed to the spirit of the gospel that pre-eminence in Christ's kingdom should be adjudged to any man or set of men on the ground of national descent, as on the ground of superior stature, physical strength, or wealth."

—Hodge's Theology, vol. III, page 811.

8. Hinism perverts the meaning of much of the Bible by its gross literalism. Many of the glorious promises which are made to the church, it regards as promises to the natural seed of Abraham. Hine, in speaking of the phrase spiritual, says,—“Whenever Israel is referred to either in the Old or the New Testament the reference is always to Israel as a nationality, to the lineal descendants of Israel of old. It is nonsense to talk about a spiritual Israel.”

We are to look upon the children of Israel not merely as a people but as God's people, as his visible church. That this is the light in which we are to regard them is evident. They were God's chosen people; so are Christians. Ex. 6: 7. 19: 5-6. Deut. 10: 5. Eph. 1: 4. They were the ransomed of the Lord, so are Christians. They were a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; so are Christians. 1 Peter 2: 9. They were the professed worshippers of God, so are Christians. They had the oracles of God, so have Christians. They had seals of the covenant, so have Christians. They were witnesses for the true religion, so are Christians. If the commonwealth of Israel was not God's visible church, there was no visible church on earth before the day of Pentecost. Stephen expressly calls it the church. Acts 7: 38.

The church under the New Testament is identical with the church under the Old Testament; it is not a different church but the very same church. It is nowhere said that the Old Testament church was abolished and a new one instituted in its place. The Saviour found a church on earth when He came. He removed what was typical of Himself in it, in-

troduced some changes in the mode of administering its affairs, increased its spirituality, and enlarged its privileges. Isaiah foretold that the Messiah, instead of destroying the church which He would find on earth, would strengthen and enlarge it by bringing the Gentiles into it. Is. 49: 13-23, 60: 1-14. Paul represents the church under the Old Testament dispensation as an olive tree into which the Gentiles had been grafted. Rom. 11: 17-24. He speaks of the Ephesians as aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, before their conversion; but as members of that commonwealth, "fellow citizens with the saints," after their conversion. Belief in Christ had brought them into the "household of God," the old household of which Abraham, Moses and David were members. Eph. 2: 11-19.

The promise which God made to Abraham that he should be the father of a numerous off-spring included two things. It implied in the first place that his literal descendants through Isaac should be very numerous. It implied, in the second place, that his spiritual off-spring, that is, those who like him would trust in God, would be at least as numerous as his natural off-spring. His natural children were a type of his spiritual children. Fairbairn's Typology, vol. I. 498. The chief reference in the promise was to the latter. Acts 3: 25-26, Rom. 4: 11-17, 9: 6-8; Gal. 3: 8-29. "It is impossible that the covenant of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,—the covenant of grace and blessing which embraces in its bosom Christ himself and the benefits of his eternal redemption,—could ever have contemplated as its real members any but spiritual and righteous persons." Typology, vol. I. 386.

As then the children of Israel constituted the church of God in Old Testament times, as the church has in all ages been one and the same church, and as the children of Abraham to whom the promises in their complete fulfilment belonged were his spiritual children, or believers, it follows that if we are Christians, whether we be of Jewish or Gentile origin, we can appropriate as our own all the promises of protection, support, and spiritual blessings ever made to God's people. We should be thankful that Hinism is a lie. Were it true we could not find the fulness of consolation in God's word which we now find. Unless we could prove that we are Israelites there are many of the exceedingly great and precious promises of the old Testament which we could not claim as ours.

As all Christians are Abraham's children, it does not necessarily follow that the Jews will be restored to their own land. The prophecies which speak of their restoration may all find their fulfilment in the extension and prosperity of the Christian church. The literal interpretation of some of those prophecies seems very unnatural. Is. 66: 20-23. Zech. 14: 16-21. Ezek. 37: 24. The New Testament makes no reference to their return.

There never has been and never will be a pure church on earth. Among the Israelites of old there were carnal Israelites and spiritual Israelites as among Christians there are nominal Christians and real Christians. Nathanael was a spiritual Israelite, or as the Saviour said, an Israelite indeed, a man whose heart corresponded with his outward professions. He is not a Jew, says Paul, which is one outwardly; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly. Rom. 2: 28-29.

It cannot be a wrong or improper thing to speak of Christians as true

Israelites, or Israelites indeed, when in the word of God, we find believers called Abraham's seed, Gal. 3:29; Israelites, Gal. 6:16, Eph. 2:12-19; comers to Mount Zion, Heb. 12:22; citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, Gal. 4:26; a royal priesthood, 1 Peter 2:9; the circumcision, Philip. 3:3, Col. 2:11; and even Jews, Rev. 2:9.

The great mistake of the Hinites is in regarding all the promises of the Old Testament as made to Israel after the flesh. They forget that it is through Christ we receive all blessings, and that those whom God really promises to bless are Christ's people. The kingdom which has colonies all over the world, which is superior to all other kingdoms, and which can never be conquered is not Victoria's kingdom but Christ's kingdom, God's church on earth.

9. Hinitism tends to begot false hopes of salvation. It is quite a common thing to hear young Hinites say,—would it not be nice to be an Israelite? If we were only sure that we are Israelites we would be sure that we would go to heaven. The Scribes and Pharisees were a step in advance of those who speak in this way; they were sure that they were Israelites, they knew that they were descendants of Jacob. They were therefore quite confident with respect to their salvation. It was their firm belief that because they had Abraham's blood in their veins they would be with Abraham forever.

It is not Abraham who holds the keys of Heaven. How did he get to Heaven himself? Not by works, but by faith. Rom. 4:1-5. Heb. 11:8-19. The people who came out of Egypt under Moses were all Abraham's children after the flesh, but were they all saved? Heb. 3:7-19. The Pharisees and Sadducees who came to John to be baptized could say, we have Abraham for our father; but could they be saved without repentance? Matt. 3:7-12. Nicodemus was a master of Israel, but could he enter the kingdom of Heaven without being born again? John 3:3. The people among whom the Saviour labored when on earth were Israelites, but are they all with Him to-day? Matt. 8:11-12, 11:20-24. The Israelites who shall be saved are not those who are Abraham's children according to the flesh, but those who like Abraham have given themselves up to God through Christ. Rom. 4:11-16. Gal. 3:7. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3:36.

Hine in his "Flashes of Light," which really are splashes of darkness, has an article on everlasting punishment. In that article he expressly teaches the blasphemous doctrine that although God threatens to cast the impenitent into hell, He may not carry out his threats. Lest it should be denied that Hine teaches such a doctrine I will quote his very words:—"Let us not be found catching at thoughts antagonistic to the scriptures by saying there cannot be eternal punishments, when God declares so plainly that there can. Let us rather hope that though pronounced they may not be inflicted, and leave the matter with our Father; for surely we have the precedent, that though the curses were pronounced against Israel, yet though dreadfully disobedient they have *not* shared them. Eternal wretchedness may be literally carried out in the case of sinners; yet it may not be *binding* on the part of God to carry it out. He can do his own will in the matter and withhold the fire, as He did the curses from Israel."

God visited the Hebrew nation with all the curses pronounced against

it. To affirm that He did not is to affirm what is contrary to sacred and profane history alike. The curses in Deut. 28th chapter, were not pronounced against either the ten tribes or the two tribes, but against the children of Israel as one people. That the curses came upon the tribes of the house of Israel as well as upon the tribes of the house of Judah, it is impossible to deny. Compare Deut. 28 : 23, 36, and 57 with 1 Kings 17 : 1st-7, 2 Kings 17 : 6 and 2 Kings 6 : 28-29.

Whatever God threatens against the wicked He will do. To those who live and die in a state of impenitency Christ will certainly say on the last day, "depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." God cannot deny himself. A. M.

XII.

AN EXHORTATION TO THE HINITES.

My dear Hinites, you think it very wicked for people to laugh at your theory. People laugh at it because they know it is one of the greatest follies of the age. There is at least as much ground for believing that Esther Cox could get an evil spirit to write down bad English on the wall for her, as there is for believing that the Saxons are Israelites. Have you ever seen Charles Mackay's "History of Extraordinary Popular Delusions?" If not, get it. It will show you what a gullible animal man is, and may lead you to think. You believe you have truth on your side! So did the wise men who laboured to discover the philosopher's stone. So did the learned judges who condemned silly old women to death for depriving their neighbour's cows of milk by the power of witchcraft. It does not follow that a man is on the right track because he thinks he is.

Look at your leaders; what are they? Do you consider Edward Hine qualified to enlighten the world? He may be an honest man. I have nothing to say against his character. Even if he were a very bad man his theory might be right. He may have good natural talents; I take for granted that he has. But he is not an educated man. He has received no theological training. He knows neither Greek nor Hebrew,—languages which a commentator would require to know. He is far from being well read in history; he shows great ignorance of it. He has not a well-balanced mind; he jumps at conclusions without any ground for them. Indeed his writings look very much like the ravings of a fanatic. Do you regard Dr. Wild as a man of power? He is anything but that. He is just one of those men who lay hold at once of new-fangled notions, and defend them without ever examining the foundations upon which they rest. Can you feel proud of those who write in the newspapers in defence of your theory? They have given in their writings at least as many proofs that they belong to the ancient Gandarians of Herodotus as they have that they belong to the ten tribes. You ought to know that.

The men who are best qualified to judge of the merits of your theory condemn it as an outrageous absurdity. Our ministers and priests, with scarcely an exception, are against you. Of course you will say that they are against you because they wish to keep the world in darkness. As there was a Judas among the apostles, so there may be wicked men among our clergymen. Can you, however, believe that all the clergymen in the

Dominion, except perhaps half a dozen, are men who from selfish purposes wish to keep the world in darkness? All the Jewish rabbis are against you. None of them ever advanced your theory. All our commentators, from Origen to Lange, are against you. All historians are against you. The truth is, there is no one of any consequence with you. I know that Hine cares nothing for the views of learned men. From the top of the great pyramid he looks down upon them all with contempt. He does not hesitate to call Prof. Rawlinson a simpleton. Rawlinson a simpleton! If the view held by Sir William Hamilton respecting the diffusion of the mind through the whole body be correct, there can be no doubt that there is more mind in Prof. Rawlinson's little finger than in the whole of Hine and all the men who try to write up his theory. You will no doubt tell me that there are some great astronomers who believe your doctrines. Surely you know that a man may be a good astronomer and yet be entirely ignorant of the Bible and ancient history. The moon, of course, may have had something to do with bringing your theory into existence; still, astronomy cannot be of the least use to you in proving its correctness.

I admit that Bishop Titcomb, and a few others who believe that the British nation are the ten tribes, are respectable men, and men of some culture. Not one of them, however, can be looked upon as an authority either in Biblical or historical subjects.

If your theory is not founded upon facts it is very unreasonable for you to believe in it. If it is founded upon facts you should produce them. Get your leaders at once to make known to the public the books which contain the account of the emigration of the tribe of Dan to Ireland, and also the books which state that the Normans came straight from Palestine to Italy and thence to Normandy.

Those who do not belong to your sect think that there are contradictions and absurdities in your theory. Things which seem clear to you as daylight do not seem so to ignorant Gentiles. If the people of the North of Ireland were pious Israelites in the days of Jeremiah, how did it happen that when the first christian teachers went among them they had no vestige of Jewish rites? Does it not seem strange even to yourselves that the Angles, who were Jews or Christians when they left Asia in the days of the apostles, were worshippers of Hertha at as early a period thereafter as the time of Tacitus? If the Normans were all good christians and men of education when they left Jerusalem, in the year 70 A.C., how came they to be savage eaters of horse-flesh and worshippers of the gods of Scandinavia when they arrived in France? If the apostles were commissioned to preach only to the ten tribes, why did James write a letter to "the twelve tribes?" How can you reconcile Paul's statement that the "twelve tribes were instantly serving God day and night" in his time, with the well-known fact that the Welsh and the Irish, two of the twelve tribes according to your theory, were, at the very moment in which the apostle was speaking, gross idolators? Acts 26: 7. You have no ground for believing that the ten tribes exist as a distinct nation at the present day. There is no promise in the whole Bible that they would be preserved as a separate people. Hosea 1: 6-7.

What became of the ten tribes? you ask me. It makes no difference to you or me what became of them. A great number of them no doubt

wholly
were w
there o
their c
with th
lonian
stick
very p

The
known
their e
the se

The
Babyl
the el
divid
amity
tiona
the
her,
idea
resto

reco

1.

S
tury
or J
new
of t
of

it
yo
th

"U

no

th

T

at

J

m

b

s

x

wholly apostatized and became mixed up among the Assyrians. They were wed to their idols when carried away, they were dispersed here and there over a large extent of country, and they were of the same race with their captors. Those of them who had some sparks of religion associated with the two tribes and united with them during the period of the Babylonian captivity. Common adversity made the stick of Ephraim and the stick of Judah one. Ezek. 37: 16—22. A few of the ten tribes, it is very probable, wended their way back to the land of their forefathers.

The great bulk of the twelve tribes remained in Babylon and were known as the Dispersion. They looked, however, upon Jerusalem as their ecclesiastical capital, and contributed towards the maintenance of the services of the temple.

That the Children of Israel forgot their old quarrels and became one in Babylon we can scarcely doubt. They would all have reason to rejoice in the elevation of Daniel, Mordecai, and Esther. "The schism which had divided the first kingdom was for rotten in the results of the general calamity. The dispersion included the twelve tribes."—Smith's Bible Dictionary, Vol. I., page 603. "The kernel of Israel yielded themselves to the attempts at approach on the part of Judah, attached themselves to her, and ranged themselves under her."—Lange's Ezekiel, page 8. "The idea that the ten tribes still exist somewhere in the world and are to be restored to their tribal state, has arisen from a misconstruction of those prophecies which refer to a return from Babylon."—Henderson on Zech. 1: 13.

Some of the ten tribes embraced the christian religion in the first century of our era. These, of course, would cease to be known as Israelites or Jews; they would call themselves christians. They would not, as our new Israelites do, glory in the flesh. There are thousands and thousands of the descendants of the ten tribes at this very day throughout the region of the ancient Assyrian empire.

That the ten tribes were beyond the Euphrates, that it is to the East of it in the year 93 A.C. when Josephus wrote his "Antiquities of the Jews," you will all admit. Jerome, who lived a long time in the East, and was the most learned man of his age, says in his commentary on Hosea,—"Unto this day the ten tribes are subject unto the kings of the Persians nor has their captivity been loosed." Jerome was born in Dalmatia in the year 331 A.C., and died in Bethlehem in the year 420. Benjamin of Tudela a Spanish Jew who travelled in the East between 1160 A.C. and 1180 found an immense number of Jews in Persia. Speaking of the Jews in a certain mountainous region, he says: "These Jews in the mountains are descendants of those who were originally led into captivity by the King Shalmaneser. They speak the Syriac language, among them are many excellent Talmudic scholars." The Rev. John H. Shedd, for many years a missionary in Persia, has a sensible and scholarly article on "The Remnants of the Twelve Tribes," in the Princeton Review for April, 1873. In that article Mr. Shedd says: "I have had opportunity to gather statistics on the ground, and to visit in person many of the Jewish communities. We have East of the Tigris, in the regions where the ten tribes were colonized, an existing population exceeding in numbers the multitude that returned to Jerusalem at the first proclamation of Cyrus. These numbers are still increased by the Jews living in Assyria

west of the Tigris. They are the remnants of a larger population, and many of them doubtless are lineal descendants of the Samaritan captives; such is their tradition. They consider themselves as belonging to the ten tribes."

In "Zachariah and his prophecies," the Bampton lecture for 1878, an admirable work by the Rev. C. H. H. Wright, I find the following statement respecting the ten tribes:—

"The fanciful notions which every now and then are put forward by some dreamer who imagines that he has discovered the supposed lost tribes, scarcely deserve much attention. Isolated bodies of Jews or Israelites may no doubt from time to time be discovered in remote countries. Several interesting works have been written on such, as for instance the little work of Mr. Fann on "The orphan Colony of Jews in China." But the recent attempt to trace the Anglo-Saxon race to an Israelitish origin, which has been made by some English enthusiasts, filled with national pride on the one hand, and with an ignorant contempt for any other form of evangelical christianity than that which they have seen and learned to value in their own land, arises only from spiritual pride and must be treated with contempt. The theory of the identity of the Anglo-Saxon race with the ten or any of the tribes of Israel, is one which could only be propounded by men ignorant of history and philology, and of the lessons to be learned from the careful study of such departments. Such theories are injurious, because they are often readily embraced by a portion of the unlearned mass of the public, and they frequently cause others to entertain an undeserved contempt for that evangelical teaching which is often dear to the adherents of such fanciful opinions."—Page 281.

Why are you so anxious to make out that you are descendants of Abraham? Even if you were Israelites, what would your gain be? Would you be better off than other christians? Do you think the Almighty loves unconverted Israelites more than He does unconverted Gentiles? Jews and Gentiles are all under sin.—Rom. 3: 9. Tribulation and anguish shall come upon every soul that doeth evil, of the Jew first and also of the Gentile.—Rom. 2: 9. Is God the God of the Jews only? Is He not also the God of the Gentiles?—Rom. 3: 29. Do you suppose that salvation is offered more sincerely and freely to the Israelites than it is to others? "Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." Are you of opinion that God has promised to convert all who can trace their origin to the twelve tribes? You cannot put your finger upon such a promise. You will not surely say that all Anglo-Saxons die christians. Do you imagine that God loves renewed Israelites more than he does renewed Gentiles? He loves all who are in Christ with the same infinite and unchangeable love. Do you look upon believing Israelites as having greater spiritual privileges and blessings than believing Gentiles? The christians of Corinth were of Gentile origin, yet Paul says to them,— "Let no man glory in men. For all things are yours, whether Paul, or Appollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." —1 Cor. 3: 21—23. All christians are justified persons, sons of God, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ Jesus. All who love God have the glorious promise that all things shall work together for their good. It cannot give much comfort to a person on his death-bed, if he be an

impenitent sinner, that there is Israelitish blood in his veins. The Son of man will not ask anyone on the last day to what race he belonged; to all his followers alike he will say: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." The new song which John heard sung in the presence of the Lamb, was not "We are Israelites," but "Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof; for Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation."

Put away your absurd notions, your injurious errors. You are chasing a phantom, following an empty bubble, feeding upon the wind. "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly." "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature." "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven."

A. M.

December 1st., 1879.